

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, July 29, 1986

The House met at 12 noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray this day in the words of Isaac Watts:

O God, our help in ages past,  
Our hope for years to come,  
Our shelter from the stormy blast,  
And our external home.

Under the shadow of Thy throne,  
Thy saints have dwelt secure,  
Sufficient is Thine arm alone,  
And our defense is sure.

O God, our help in ages past,  
Our hope for years to come,  
Be Thou our guide while troubles last,  
And our external home!

Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 270, nays 117, answered "present" 3, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 254]

## YEAS—270

Ackerman	Bevill	Byron
Akaka	Biaggi	Callahan
Alexander	Boggs	Carper
Anderson	Boland	Carr
Andrews	Boner (TN)	Chapman
Annunzio	Bonior (MI)	Chappell
Anthony	Bonker	Clinger
Applegate	Borski	Coleman (TX)
Archer	Bosco	Combest
Aspin	Boucher	Conyers
Atkins	Boxer	Cooper
AuCoin	Brooks	Coyne
Bateman	Broomfield	Daniel
Bates	Brown (CA)	Darden
Bedell	Bruce	Daschle
Beilenson	Bryant	Davis
Bennett	Burton (CA)	de la Garza
Berman	Bustamante	Dellums

Derrick	LaFalce	Roemer	Evans (IA)	Lloyd	Schroeder
Dicks	Lantos	Rose	Fawell	Loeffler	Schuetz
Dingell	Latta	Rostenkowski	Fiedler	Lott	Sensenbrenner
DioGuardi	Leath (TX)	Rowland (GA)	Fields	Lungren	Shaw
Donnelly	Lehman (CA)	Roybal	Gallo	Mack	Shuster
Dorgan (ND)	Lehman (FL)	Rudd	Gekas	Madigan	Sikorski
Dowdy	Leland	Russo	Gingrich	McCandless	Skeen
Downey	Levin (MI)	Sabo	Goodling	McCollum	Slaughter
Duncan	Levine (CA)	Savage	Gregg	McGrath	Smith, Denny
Durbin	Lipinski	Scheuer	Guarini	McKernan	(OR)
Dwyer	Long	Schneider	Hansen	Meyers	Smith, Robert
Dymally	Lowry (WA)	Schulze	Henry	Michel	(NH)
Early	Lujan	Schumer	Hiler	Miller (OH)	Smith, Robert
Eckart (OH)	Lukens	Seiberling	Holt	Mitchell	(OR)
Eckert (NY)	Lundine	Sharp	Hopkins	Molinar	Snowe
Edgar	Manton	Shelby	Hunter	Monson	Solomon
Edwards (CA)	Markey	Shumway	Hyde	Moorhead	Strang
English	Martin (IL)	Siljander	Ireland	Oxley	Stump
Erdreich	Martin (NY)	Sisisky	Jacobs	Packard	Sundquist
Evans (IL)	Matsui	Skeltton	Kindness	Pashayan	Swindall
Fascell	Mazzoli	Slaterry	Kolbe	Penny	Tauke
Fazio	McCain	Smith (FL)	Kramer	Ridge	Thomas (CA)
Fish	McCloskey	Smith (IA)	Lagomarsino	Roberts	Vucanovich
Flippo	McCurdy	Smith (NE)	Leach (IA)	Rogers	Walker
Florio	McDade	Smith (NJ)	Lent	Roth	Weber
Foley	McEwen	Snyder	Lewis (CA)	Roukema	Whitehurst
Foley	McHugh	Solarz	Lewis (FL)	Rowland (CT)	Wolf
Frank	McKinney	Spence	Lightfoot	Saxton	Young (FL)
Frenzel	McMillan	Spratt	Livingston	Schaefer	Zschau
Frost	Mikulski	St Germain			
Fuqua	Miller (CA)	Staggers			
Gaydos	Miller (WA)	Stallings			
Gejdenson	Mineta	Stark			
Gephardt	Montgomery	Stenholm			
Gibbons	Moody	Stokes			
Gilman	Morrison (CT)	Stratton			
Glickman	Morrison (WA)	Studds			
Gonzalez	Mrazek	Sweeney			
Gordon	Murphy	Swift			
Gradison	Murtha	Synar			
Gray (IL)	Myers	Tauzin			
Gray (PA)	Natcher	Taylor			
Hall (OH)	Neal	Thomas (GA)			
Hall, Ralph	Nelson	Torres			
Hamilton	Nichols	Torricelli			
Hammerschmidt	Nielson	Towns			
Hatcher	Nowak	Trafficant			
Hawkins	Oberstar	Traxler			
Hayes	Obey	Udall			
Hefner	Olin	Valentine			
Hendon	Ortiz	Vander Jagt			
Hertel	Owens	Vento			
Horton	Panetta	Visclosky			
Howard	Pease	Volkmer			
Hubbard	Pepper	Walgren			
Huckaby	Perkins	Watkins			
Hughes	Petri	Waxman			
Hutto	Pickle	Weiss			
Jeffords	Porter	Wheat			
Jenkins	Price	Whitley			
Johnson	Pursell	Whittaker			
Jones (NC)	Quillen	Whitten			
Jones (OK)	Rahall	Wirth			
Jones (TN)	Rangel	Wise			
Kanjorski	Ray	Wolpe			
Kaptur	Regula	Wortley			
Kastenmeier	Reid	Wright			
Kennelly	Richardson	Wyden			
Kildee	Rinaldo	Yates			
Klecza	Ritter	Yatron			
Kolter	Rodino	Young (AK)			
	Roe	Young (MO)			

## NAYS—117

Armey	Chandler	Craig
Badham	Chapple	Crane
Bartlett	Cheney	Dannemeyer
Barton	Clay	Daub
Bereuter	Coats	DeLay
Billirakis	Cobey	DeWine
Bliley	Coble	Dickinson
Boehlert	Coleman (MO)	Dornan (CA)
Boulter	Conte	Dreier
Brown (CO)	Coughlin	Edwards (OK)
Burton (IN)	Courter	Emerson

Evans (IA)	Lloyd	Schroeder
Fawell	Loeffler	Schuetz
Fiedler	Lott	Sensenbrenner
Fields	Lungren	Shaw
Gallo	Mack	Shuster
Gekas	Madigan	Sikorski
Gingrich	McCandless	Skeen
Goodling	McCollum	Slaughter
Gregg	McGrath	Smith, Denny
Guarini	McKernan	(OR)
Hansen	Meyers	Smith, Robert
Henry	Michel	(NH)
Hiler	Miller (OH)	Smith, Robert
Holt	Mitchell	(OR)
Hopkins	Molinar	Snowe
Hunter	Monson	Solomon
Hyde	Moorhead	Strang
Ireland	Oxley	Stump
Jacobs	Packard	Sundquist
Kindness	Pashayan	Swindall
Kolbe	Penny	Tauke
Kramer	Ridge	Thomas (CA)
Lagomarsino	Roberts	Vucanovich
Leach (IA)	Rogers	Walker
Lent	Roth	Weber
Lewis (CA)	Roukema	Whitehurst
Lewis (FL)	Rowland (CT)	Wolf
Lightfoot	Saxton	Young (FL)
Livingston	Schaefer	Zschau

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Kemp	Lowery (CA)	Mica
------	-------------	------

## NOT VOTING—40

Barnard	Fowler	Moakley
Barnes	Franklin	Mollohan
Bentley	Garcia	Moore
Breaux	Green	Oakar
Campbell	Grotberg	Parris
Carney	Gunderson	Robinson
Coelho	Hartnett	Stangeland
Collins	Hillis	Tallon
Crockett	Kasich	Weaver
Dixon	Kostmayer	Williams
Dyson	MacKay	Wilson
Feighan	Marlenee	Wyllie
Foglietta	Martinez	
Ford (TN)	Mavroules	

□ 1215

Mrs. ROUKEMA changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mrs. Emery, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 24, 1986:

H.J. Res. 652. Joint resolution to provide for the temporary extension of certain programs relating to housing and community development, and for other purposes.

On July 1, 1986:

H.R. 4420. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to revise the retirement system for new members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

On July 2, 1986:

H.J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning July 27, 1986, as "National Nuclear Medicine Week";

H.J. Res. 429. Joint resolution to designate July 2, 1986, as "National Literacy Day";

H.J. Res. 664. Joint resolution to designate July 3, 1986, as "Let Freedom Ring Day," and to request the President to issue a proclamation encouraging the people of the United States to ring bells on such day immediately following the relighting of the torch of the Statue of Liberty; and

H.R. 4515. An act making urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes.

On July 8, 1986:

H.R. 4841. An act to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act with respect to State allotments under the Act.

On July 9, 1986:

H.R. 237. An act to amend the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act to provide that any attorney who collects debts on behalf of a client shall be subject to the provisions of such Act; and

H.R. 5036. An act to make technical corrections to the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965.

On July 11, 1986:

H.R. 4801. An act to amend section 994 of title 28, United States Code, to clarify certain duties of the U.S. Sentencing Commission.

#### SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE ALTON R. WALDON, JR., AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Will the dean of the New York delegation, Mr. STRATTON, bring to the well the newly elected Member? Any members of the New York delegation who would like to join them in the well are welcome.

Mr. WALDON appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

□ 1225

#### REQUEST FOR RECOGNITION OF A MEMBER

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL] may have 1 minute to welcome the new Member. I make this request because he is a personal friend of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

#### A SPECIAL WELCOME TO THE HONORABLE ALTON R. WALDON, JR.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues that this is a great honor for me to welcome to this distinguished body ALTON R. WALDON, JR.

I remember many years ago when I first came to this House, for 6 months I was only referred to as the "person who replaced the late distinguished Adam Clayton Powell." I do not want this to happen to AL WALDON. AL WALDON follows our beloved late colleague, Joe Addabbo, but he comes here as one of the most popular State legislators we ever had coming from the County of Queens.

He came to New York City from Florida with his dad, who came to Brooklyn, worked as a longshoreman, and raised his son through the public schools of the city of New York. AL, of course, has distinguished himself in so many different areas that I do hope, when you find that area where you feel most comfortable, that you will be able to come and speak to AL WALDON, and you will find that he is going to make one great Member of the U.S. Congress. Whether we talk about his ability as a soldier where he served, how he came through the ranks as a patrolman on the New York City Police Department to become a captain, how he became a distinguished human rights specialist, or how he distinguished himself as a New York State legislator, each of you will find in your own way some reason to agree with us in New York that he is one heck of a great legislator.

The only area where I believe AL was not too successful was when he started to embark on his singing career, and I can only say one thing: After listening to the leadership of this House, even there maybe we find a talent to become a part of the House leadership.

He brings with him his wife Barbara and his three children, and I suspect he has a dog which will take care of the primaries to make certain that in this area, once he wins that primary, we have someone who will definitely be sworn in again next year.

Mr. Speaker, we welcome his friends from Queens and we welcome his friends from New York. The New York delegation, as well as the Congressional Black Caucus, feels strengthened by his presence, but we want all of you, Republicans and Democrats alike, to know that AL WALDON will make us all proud. Welcome to the House of Representatives.

#### AN EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION AND THANKS BY A NEWLY ELECTED MEMBER

(Mr. WALDON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALDON. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, how sweet it is.

I am the son of a man who could not read and write, and only in America could this happen, to have someone to come from abject poverty, from Pat-

chen Avenue in Brooklyn and to sit in this august body.

I owe a lot to a lot of people, to my mother and father and to my friends from Brooklyn and Queens, but there is a lady and a young man representing my grandmother and his brother and sister who could not be with us today, and I think it would be appropriate, Mr. Speaker, if you see a young man who is 6 foot 3 and 260 pounds and who will be the starting offensive guard for Hobart College right up there—Iany, why don't you stand up, son?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will caution the gentleman that the Chair has been extremely lenient. The rules do not allow clapping from the gallery, and the gentleman cannot acknowledge anybody in the gallery.

Mr. WALDON. I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker. So I will not recognize my wife, Barbara, who is sitting there next to my son. I appreciate that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will overlook that.

Mr. WALDON. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, this is the proudest moment of my life. I will come here and work with you 7 days a week, 24 hours a day, on behalf of the people of the Sixth Congressional District, the people of the city and State of New York, and the people of all America. Thank you for having me. God bless each and every one of you.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will announce that there will be no further 1-minute speeches until the hour of 5:45 p.m., at which time we hope the formal business of the day will be concluded.

#### AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS AT ANY TIME ON THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1986, TO RECEIVE IN JOINT MEETING THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Thursday, September 18, 1986, for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting the President of the Republic of the Philippines, Corazon P. Aquino.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.



# RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, July 29, 1986.

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.,  
Speaker of the House, H-204, The Capitol,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign from the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

Sincerely,

CHESTER G. ATKINS,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

# RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AND AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Science and Technology and as a member of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, July 28, 1986.

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.,  
H-204, Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign my positions on the House Science and Technology and Public Works and Transportation Committee, pursuant to the rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Very truly yours,

MICHAEL A. ANDREWS,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

# RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Small Business:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, July 29, 1986.

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to inform you that I hereby resign my seat on the House Committee on Small Business.

Sincerely,

JIM CHAPMAN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

# ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Democratic caucus and by direction of the caucus, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 515) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 515

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Chester G. Atkins, Massachusetts;  
Committee on Science and Technology: Jim Chapman, Texas;

Committee on Ways and Means: Michael A. Andrews, Texas.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5234, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1987

Mr. WHEAT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-721) on the resolution (H. Res. 516) waiving certain points of order against consideration of the bill (H.R. 5234) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1235

# DISAPPROVING THE PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATION TO EXTEND CERTAIN WAIVER AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO ROMANIA

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 152 of Public Law 93-618, the Trade Act of 1974, I move to discharge the Committee on Ways and Means from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 475) disapproving the President's recommendation to extend certain waiver authority under the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to Romania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 475

Resolved, That the House of Representatives does not approve the extension of the authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 recommended by the President to the Congress on June 3, 1986,

with respect to the Socialist Republic of Romania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I want to express a particular word of appreciation to my distinguished Trade Subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Florida. He will at a later time introduce a motion to table this motion that we have under consideration, but he was gracious enough to let us address the question first. For that I am in his debt.

Let me explain first of all what this resolution is about. The President under the Trade Act can grant waivers of most-favored-nation treatment prohibitions dealing with Communist countries if those countries abide by the criteria that were established in the Jackson-Vanik bill dealing with the right of emigration. If the Congress sees fit to override a Presidential waiver, then this is the mechanism for so accomplishing that objective.

However, Mr. Speaker, at the outset let me explain that the termination date is August 3 wherein both Houses of Congress can take this action. Inasmuch as the Senate has not proceeded to prepare a companion piece, the significance of the vote that we register on this issue in the House is simply to communicate a message. It is an expression of indignation on the part of Members of the House of Representatives over the failure of the Government of Romania to live up to the criteria of Jackson-Vanik and to live up to any standards of decency with respect to observance of human rights.

The Jackson-Vanik legislation requires that a country will not be granted MFN if:

First, it denies its citizens the right or opportunity to emigrate.

Second, it imposes more than a nominal tax on emigration or on the visas or other documents required for emigration, for any purpose or cause.

Third, it imposes more than a nominal tax, levy, fine, fee, or other charge on any citizens as a consequence of the desires of such citizen to emigrate to the country of his choice.

First, on November 1, 1983, the Romanian Government announced the imposition of an emigration tax.

The tax required any prospective emigrant to reimburse his government in hard Western currency for the full cost of his or her education above the

secondary level. The levies include \$2,000 for minors—I am quoting American dollar figures—\$6,400 for university students, \$8,000 for skilled laborers, \$16,000 for engineers, and \$20,000 for physicians. Since Romanian citizens are prohibited by law from possessing Western currency, though, the likelihood of would-be emigrants being able to pay the tax is very remote.

Second, former Gen. Ion Pacepa, the defector who had previously served as President Ceausescu's personal hit man, supervising assassination efforts, and in addition to that the equivalent of the head of their KGB, reported in the *Washingtonian*:

Over the years, many hundreds of millions of dollars were secretly paid to Romania, along with low-interest credits issued through the DIE—

Which is in effect their KGB—

as bonuses for increasing the emigration quotas. For reasons of secrecy, most of the payments were made in cash and only in U.S. dollars. No other member of the Romanian government knew anything about them except the Prime Minister, who was given only a general briefing and instructed that if the matter even came up, he should vehemently deny any suggestion that Jews and Germans were being sold.

During the hearings that we had on this legislation to overturn the waiver of the ban on MFN to Romania, we had substantiating testimony from those people representing the communities in question as to reasons why Jewish emigration was permitted and emigration to West Germany was permitted. It was because the Romanian Government had this behind the scenes deal of putting a levy on the head of any Romanian citizen who wanted to get out, who was either of Jewish nationality or otherwise.

In addition to this, there are Romanians awaiting U.S. visas or refugee documents, according to the Finance Committee trade staff report to us, who have faced severe sanctions. They wait for several years, during which time they repeatedly pay to renew exit visas; namely, every 3 months, or passports every 6 months.

Once granted emigration permits, they must divest themselves of all real property at confiscatory state-set rates, and then rent what they previously owned until they leave. They are routinely fired from their jobs. They become stateless individuals with no access to social services, including schooling for their children.

In addition to these violations, clear violations of the Jackson-Vanik provisions, Mr. Speaker, there has come to develop with the passage of time the application of human rights criteria as a consideration in the waiver of MFN to Communist countries.

I have some colleagues who wish to speak on this subject, Mr. Speaker. I want to guarantee that we provide time to some of those who were eyewitnesses, having visited Romania re-

cently, eyewitnesses to some of the atrocities, especially to organized religion in that country.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reserve the balance of my time, because my understanding is that my distinguished committee chairman wishes to speak.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI].

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to discharge House Resolution 475 from the Committee on Ways and Means. House Resolution 475 would overturn the President's recent decision to extend most-favored-nation trading status for Romania for 1 more year. I oppose the motion and the resolution on both substantive and procedural grounds.

My substantive concerns over the resolution stem from the fact that title IV of the Trade Act of 1974—the Jackson-Vanik amendment—is aimed at promoting the freedom for citizens from Communist countries to emigrate to the country of their choice. It is not a human rights law, as the sponsors of House Resolution 475 would have you believe.

The annual MFN renewal process has proved to be a highly effective lever in achieving the goal of increased emigration. The numbers speak for themselves: In 1975, the year that MFN was granted to Romania, only 6,975 Romanians were allowed by their Government to leave for the United States, Israel, or Germany. In 1985, 17,350 Romanians were allowed to depart to those countries. Legal emigration from Romania now exceeds the combined total emigration from the Soviet Union, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia. MFN has also strengthened our hand in improving the human rights conditions for thousands of Romanians choosing to remain in Romania but who are being persecuted for their religious or political activities.

While the resolution's sponsors are understandably disturbed over reports of human rights violations in Romania, as are we, cutting off MFN will only cut hope for the thousands of Romanians waiting to join their families in the West or seeking to start a new life here. No one supports human rights abuse and religious persecution. We don't. You don't. But the real issue here is whether we retain the leverage we now have to improve one important form of human right—freedom of emigration—or throw it away by voting to cut off MFN for Romania.

It is significant that during hearings by the Trade Subcommittee, many important religious groups and human rights organizations testified in favor of continuing MFN—from B'nai B'rith

to the International League for Human Rights. The administration also supports the continuation of MFN for Romania.

The procedural concern over this motion and the resolution itself relates to their constitutionality. In the 1983 Chadha case, the Supreme Court struck down as unconstitutional the very sort of one-House veto measure represented by House Resolution 475. I strongly urge Members not to risk needless, costly, and potentially time-consuming litigation on this issue. Vote against the motion to discharge House Resolution 475 from the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 475 to disapprove the administration's request to waive key human rights provisions of the Jackson-Vanik emigration standards in order to continue most-favored-nation trade status for Romania.

I am disappointed with the administration's announcement of its plans to renew MFN for Romania for next year. There are too many unanswered questions and, unfortunately, there are too many lives being destroyed and rights being violated for us not to seriously review MFN for Romania.

Of particular concern to me is the administration's belief that MFN is posing as some sort of "leverage," a wedge for effecting domestic reforms. After visiting the country, speaking with the people, and learning of continuing reports of domestic repression, torture, and persecution, I submit that the only actions taken by the United States that translate into leverage are congressional hearings and floor action like we are taking today. Allowing preferential trade status is not leverage. It is not justice. It is a mockery of everything Americans stand for.

Second, in its statement on MFN extension to Romania, the administration said: "Granting of MFN gives U.S. companies the ability to compete in those markets." I do not dispute that this is a positive benefit for American businesses; however, the full benefit is realized only by the Romanians who get their cake—economic support—and eat it too—continuation of domestic repression. It is important to note that the United States has a trade deficit with Romania of 1 to 4.8.

There are many other unanswered questions which surface upon reading the administration's statement of renewal for Romania. What about the continued repression of religious freedoms? What about the fact those religious and political dissidents who are released from prison are not allowed to remain in Romania, but must emigrate? What about reports from high-



ranking intelligence defectors of widespread espionage activity against the United States?

We should heed the voice of Ion Pacepa, the highest ranking intelligence officer to defect from a Soviet bloc country. He has stated:

The West's support to Romania over the past 17 years, since its spectacular reaction to the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, has not brought about any change in (Romania President Nicolai) Ceausescu's policies toward his own people, in terms of the economy, the standard of living, or human rights. Romania's political police are now the most oppressive in the entire Soviet bloc. The ratio of security forces to the total population is one to 15, higher than that in any Western jail. (The Washingtonian, December 1985.)

Mr. Speaker, we should also heed the voices of American citizens. I would like to read from a recent letter I received from a constituent. He said:

Although last year I co-signed a statement with Rev. George Crisan and others in favor of renewing the MFN status of Romania, this year such action would be impossible without severely suppressing the voice of my conscience. Other than high-placed officials, with obvious interest in toing the Party line, all of the Romanians I spoke with urged me to convey their disapproval regarding the efforts to renew the MFN status . . . . The Romanians I spoke with argue that to continue to grant Romania MFN status is to allow Ceausescu to plunge the country into deeper and deeper chaos, with no real benefits at all filtering down to the population in general.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot control the internal politics of another nation, nor do we seek to—we just seek to. What we seek is to recognize that we underwrite the tortures, the policies, the deaths and repression in Romania when we voluntarily continue the economic support provided under continuation of MFN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. We must take action. We must disapprove the administration's plans to renew Romania's MFN status.

□ 1250

Mr. Speaker, what we would like to do when given the opportunity is to suspend the most-favored-nation status for 6 months or for 3 months, to send a message. If we do not do this, we will allow the persecution to continue to take place.

So, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge this on frankly the second most important human rights vote that this Congress will have to deal with.

If you care deeply about the fact that a Catholic priest is beaten to death for saying that Christmas, a sacred day, should be a holiday; if you feel deeply about the persecution and torture that Father Calciu went through; if you care about the Baptist ministers that have been arrested and the Pentecostal ministers that have been arrested; if you care about these things that have happened in this country, if you care about the KGB-

type secret police, if you care about the bulldozing of the churches, then I ask you to vote no on this tabling motion.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I did not come here today to defend Romania. I came here to talk in America's best interest, and to talk in the best interest of freedom for people within the boundaries of Romania.

Let us look at Romania. Romania comes from that very troubled area of Europe where for thousands of years religious persecution has been a way of life. Romania comes from that southern part of Eastern Europe controlled by the Russians that does not enjoy the religious liberties of the first amendment that we cherish so highly in our society.

If you look at the whole history of Romania, you will find that it has always been a troubled country, and I regret that it still is somewhat a troubled country.

But what are the best interests of America? Romania sits upon the border of Russia. It has a frontier with Russia of over 150 miles of land, plus a lot of water. It is very near the city of Chernobyl, and it has suffered needlessly from that Russian accident there. Most of its exports to other parts of Eastern Europe, as well as to Western Europe, were cut off because of radioactive contamination.

What is Romania's policy toward the Soviet Union? When you go to Romania you find that there are no Soviet troops in Romania. The Romanian foreign policy line is independent of Russia. No Eastern bloc Warsaw Pact maneuvers are allowed to be held in Romania. Romania is trying its level best to be independent of all of the trials and tribulations and wars that have racked that area of the world.

In 1974, when we adopted the Jackson-Vanik amendment, there was very little emigration from Romania. Since that time 154,000 people have emigrated from Romania. Let me repeat that figure: 154,000 people have emigrated from Romania, either to Israel or to the West.

Romania has had a drain of its better-trained and better-educated people unmatched by any of the Eastern bloc countries. The exodus from Romania is far higher than it is from Russia. In fact, the exodus from Romania allowed by the Government is larger than from Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Russia, and Bulgaria all put together. So while we have not gotten everything out of Romania that we would like to get by the Jackson-Vanik amendment, we have gotten a whole host of things.

Freedom of religion in Romania—let us look at it, because that is the issue here. Romania is one of those areas that was dominated first of all by the

Eastern Orthodox Church. However, Romania now not only recognizes Israel, but Romania has training centers for the Jewish faith that operate freely with the Government's blessing. The Army of the Lord—probably one of the most unusual Christian movements in the world, with some 500,000 people in Romania—opposes the cutoff of MFN which the Crane resolution would do. This is a group of Christians not recognized by the Romanian Government, but not persecuted by the Romanian Government either. Its members gather frequently in homes in Romania to express their own religious views.

Most of the major Jewish organizations and many of the Christian organizations who are involved with this issue supported MFN for Romania.

Romania has tried to be a good trading partner, but unfortunately Romania is stuck with a large external debt. Instead of reneging on the debt, it has cut back sharply on its imports and increased its exports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NATCHER). The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] has expired.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

So I urge my colleagues to help freedom of emigration—remember, 154,000 people have emigrated from Romania. If we deny them MFN, even for 6 months, there will be no emigration. Perhaps never again will there be any emigration of religious dissidents from Romania, or other people, not only religious dissidents.

It is important that we keep track of what is in the best interest of America. It is to continue working with this country, with its leaders—its present leaders and its future leaders—trying to promulgate our ideas of freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom from Russian domination. All of these conditions are much better now than they were at the end of World War II, when Romania was unfortunately assigned to be a part of the Russian empire or sphere of domination—a historical mistake.

Mr. Speaker, when the time comes and I make the motion to table the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] I hope that all Members will vote "aye."

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

I encourage my colleagues on this side of the aisle to join with me to vote in favor of discharging House Resolution 475 from the Ways and Means Committee. We need a strong vote.

Discharging and passing this resolution will not end MFN for Romania. That would require action by both bodies and a signature from the President.

However, bringing this resolution up and passing it will send a strong signal to the Romanian Government that there is deep congressional concern about human rights violations and repression in Romania.

I would much prefer that we were voting today on a bill like H.R. 3599, which the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and I have introduced to temporarily suspend MFN to Romania for 6 months. During this time, the administration would assess whether progress was being made concerning religious freedom and human rights. Positive action on the part of the Romanian Government would permit MFN to be restored.

Our bill was considered at a hearing by the Subcommittee on Trade on June 10, 1986. A companion bill in the other body will be the subject of a hearing on August 1, 1986.

At this time, we have not received indications concerning when our bill might be acted upon further. A significant vote in favor of the motion to discharge before us would encourage the subcommittee to take early action on our bill.

I share the frustration of the gentleman from Illinois about the matter of MFN for Romania. For 11 years now, we have been giving MFN to Romania. I fail to see what we are getting in return. Certainly, trade with Romania remains a one-way street. In 1985, Romania exported to us about \$949.7 million worth of goods, yet imported from the United States only about \$206.5 million worth of goods.

More importantly, significant human rights violations continue. My special concern for the past year has been the matter of religious repression in Romania.

In July 1985, I went on a private factfinding mission to Romania, sponsored by Christian Response International. Along with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], I saw firsthand the persecution of Christian believers.

Churches have been bulldozed, Bibles have been turned into toilet paper, and pastors and lay leaders have been jailed or heavily fined for preaching. Beatings and other forms of torture are given to religious prisoners of conscience. At great personal risks, individuals would come up to us, and as they shook our hands, they would press messages into our palms about their family members in prison and other personal tribulations imposed on them. We were deeply moved by the faith and courage of the Romanian believers.

Unfortunately, the Romanian Government has no shame over its persecution of Christians. That Government will not be moved by mere expressions of concern or bad publicity. The only way to get their attention is to suspend MFN.

While I prefer the approach offered by H.R. 3599, it is very important today to send the strongest possible signal to the Romanian Government. Defeat of the motion before us might be misinterpreted by that Government as congressional approval of their repression.

I remain hopeful and confident that a bill like H.R. 3599 will eventually be enacted. In the meantime, it is imperative to keep the pressure up on Romania through whatever opportunities arise.

I commend the gentleman from Illinois for his efforts on behalf of this issue, especially in the Subcommittee on Trade. I urge my colleagues to take advantage of the motion he is offering today to place the House firmly on record against the repression in Romania. Vote "yes" on the motion to discharge House Resolution 475.

□ 1300

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL].

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves today in a rather strange situation. We are to consider House Resolution 475, disapproving the President's action extending the emigration waiver for Romania. This waiver extension allows Romania to continue to receive most-favored-nation trade status for 1 more year.

The procedure for considering this resolution, better known as the one-House veto, has been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in a 1983 decision, *Immigration and Naturalization Service versus Chadha*. Yet, although passage of the resolution would have no legal effect, the House rules require this body to follow the procedure until the statute is repealed. So, we must take the time to go through the motions, however meaningless.

We could ask ourselves whether, if this discharge motion is passed and we move to 20 hours of debate, and if this resolution were constitutional, would the merits of the situation demand that we end most-favored-nation status for Romania. I believe we should not.

The administration, and many business and human rights groups, believe that most-favored-nation status has been an important tool in gaining increased emigration from Romania. The Council of Presidents of American Jewish Organizations, including B'nai B'rith and the American Jewish Committee, the Christian rescue effort for Emancipation of Dissident, and the

International League for Human Rights all support a continuation of most-favored-nation status along with continued pressure for further liberalization of emigration procedures.

Over the last 10 years, the number of emigrants from Romania to all parts of the world has risen from 6,975 to more than 17,000 persons. Legal emigration from Romania now far exceeds the combined emigration from the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia. I believe, as do the organizations I have mentioned, that there is a clear relationship between the numbers of emigrants and the commercial and political leverage provided by most-favored-nation status.

We have heard of the travails of Father Calcin. He was treated in an inhuman way. But, MFN got him out. MFN won't make Romania observe our religious freedoms, but it does help relieve individual human rights problems.

In spite of a severe international debt problem that has curtailed Romanian purchases, United States-Romanian trade still exceeds \$1 billion and continues to grow. United States businesses still consider Romania an important market and have supported continuing to expand the commercial relationship.

Mr. Speaker, the House has not voted on any introduced resolution involving the President's waiver authority since 1979. There was a vote on a motion to table in 1983. In 1983, this procedure was ruled unconstitutional. I believe it is important for political, commercial, and human rights leverage to continue most-favored-nation status for Romania.

Finally, I would invite the attention of this House to a letter from Secretary Shultz in which he cites the independence of Romania from the U.S.S.R. in several important respects, and his belief that MFN helps us to ameliorate what we consider human rights violations.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the motion to discharge so as not to risk lengthy debate on an unconstitutional resolution.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,  
Washington, July 28, 1986.

HON. BILL FRENZEL,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FRENZEL: I have been informed that a motion has been introduced in the House of Representatives to discharge from the Committee on Ways and Means a bill, H.R. 475, which would withdraw Most Favored Nation tariff status from Romania.

The Department strongly opposes adoption of this bill. As you know, the President determined on June 3 that MFN for Romania should be renewed under the terms of the 1974 Trade Act. The Department recognizes and shares the concerns of many members of Congress about violations of human rights in Romania. We believe, however, that the access and leverage provided us by Romanian interest in MFN has given us the



ability to ameliorate those conditions. Our policy has achieved important results in human terms, including heightened emigration levels, releases of political and religious activists from jail, and access to press our concerns about religious rights issues. These gains fall short of what we would like to achieve, but in my judgment, revocation or suspension of MFN would make the human rights situation in Romania worse, not better. It also should be stressed that Romanian foreign policy continues to be independent of the Soviet Union in several important respects, and that this was an important reason for our decision to extend MFN to Romania in 1975.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE P. SHULTZ.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SILJANDER].

Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I rise in strong support of the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

□ 1310

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the procedural nature of this question disguises some underlying substantive questions.

I am not going to address the procedural question. I'd rather discuss one aspect of this issue that has personal meaning to me.

For some time now, I have been working with representatives of the Church of the Nazarene who have brothers and sisters in the Faith in Romania who are experiencing all kinds of harassment as Christians from their government.

My most recent information is that while things have not improved for members of that church, they are at least receiving aid packages from the United States and have not been directly persecuted recently by Romanian officials.

This is not what I call human rights improvement because under a totalitarian regime, the pressure of persecution can start again when it suits the rulers.

But, as of this moment, members of the Church of the Nazarene, a small church dedicated only to prayer and good works, are receiving aid which is at least something to be thankful for.

In years past, there have been open attacks on members of this church in the state-controlled press and aid sent from the United States never reached its intended recipients.

I believe that men and women of good will can disagree on the question of whether or not extending most-favored-nation status to Romania helps or hurts religious freedom and human rights in that country.

The President believes "existing access and influence" of the United States can be preserved by extending most-favored-nation status since, in his words, "extension of most-favored-nation status has facilitated American citizens' access to coreligionists in Romania as well as the flow of several million dollars worth of material assistance to them each year."

We are faced with the usual questions: In dealing with dictatorial regimes, is it better to take economic measures in the hopes of improving human rights, or is it better to keep already existing economic benefits as a lever to move the government toward human rights?

Neither position is, in itself, a "hard" or "soft" line. What matters is the effect each position has on improving human rights.

I must confess that in this case, my heart is with the position taken by our colleague, Mr. CRANE. Romania has had the most-favored-nation status for 11 years. No truly informed person really believes any more that Romania, under its current leadership, is mellowing or becoming more liberal. The best that can be said is that, from time to time, gestures toward the West are made.

But here is the hard part. No matter how bad we find the Romanian Government, what about the captive people of Romania? What is best for them? The answer isn't quite as clear as some of us would suggest.

If we vote for House Resolution 475, we in effect throw away the tool of most-favored-nation status. But if we vote against it—if we support the President—we retain that tool.

The question is: Which method helps the people of Romania? Which approach offers the hope of greater emigration, perhaps even limited extensions of religious freedom?

My heart tells me to vote for House Resolution 475. But my knowledge of what the religious minorities of Romania are suffering tells me that even this small tool ought to be retained in this case.

When an American coreligionist of mine goes to Romania these days to help members of the church, at least he gets into the country; at least he sees and talks to our people.

What will happen if we cut off most-favored-nation status? Will he have the same access? Will those who ask us to vote for a cutoff guaranteed that we will still have access?

I wish I knew with absolute certainty I am right. But I don't. I can only do what I think is right.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, this matter of favored-nation status for Romania and the impact of the Jackson-Vanik amendment is something

that has concerned me for a number of years because of the fact that my hometown happens to be the home of the General Electric Co., in Schenectady; and the home of the large steam turbine generator business in the General Electric complex.

In fact, as you may know, this has been a very tough year for the steam turbine business. We have lost out almost completely on overseas orders, and 1 month ago the General Electric management announced, in Schenectady, that some 1,400 jobs in the steam turbine business were going to be eliminated, not only blue-collar employees, but also white-collar employees.

Over the last 3 years, because of the nonexistence of steam turbine orders, the work force in Schenectady General Electric has gone down from 27,000 to 12,000.

The one bright spot in this otherwise deplorable economic situation has been turbine orders from Romania. Back in 1982, the Romanians agreed to buy two turbine generators; these were to be financed by the Eximbank; but a few months later the Romanians defaulted on their agricultural loans from the United States and so they could no longer get the Eximbank assistance.

However, the Romanians proposed an ingenious scheme of barter to continue the production of these turbines. GE agreed to proceed piece by piece on the turbines, and in return the Romanians would provide Romanian nails to the manager of the turbine division, and also Romanian wine.

The turbine manager complained that he had Romanian nails coming out of his ears!

Moreover, as American and foreign steam turbine manufacturers wait out a revival of the steam turbine market, the Romanian authorities are still proposing to purchase two more of these quality turbines on the same barter business.

I believe we owe the people of Romania our gratitude for their unique efforts to keep the employees of one of America's greatest corporations gainfully employed for a longer period than would have been the case as a result of Romanian nails and Romanian wine. I have sampled some of the Romanian wine, but so far I haven't tried the Romanian nails.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that we should treat this fascinating country by denying them the most-favored-nation status which we have long granted them and which President Reagan has strongly supported.

As a result I shall vote with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] and oppose the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

As a result of the efforts of the Romanians, they have made it possible to preserve American steam turbine technology during this economic crisis period, so that when the market situation turns up again, as it surely will turn up, that turbine customers will be seeking to buy American turbines rather than English turbines from Parsons, or Swiss turbines from Brown & Boveri, or from Hitachi in Japan.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members will vote today to permit the gentleman from Illinois to bring his resolution to the floor disapproving the President's recommendation to extend MFN to Romania for another year. No matter how Members may feel on the particular issue, I would submit that the time has come for an extensive reevaluation of human rights in Romania including emigration policy, and religious freedom. The motion before us would simply discharge House Resolution 475 from the Ways and Means Committee and, thus, permit Members to consider this important issue.

I have always believed that human rights are indivisible. They are God given, not manmade. Respect for the human rights of their citizens by the countries of the world isn't optional. Clearly it is fundamental, and is the only legitimate basis for genuine trust and friendship in bilateral relations. While the Jackson-Vanik provision of the 1974 Trade Act cites emigration policy as the chief criteria for conference of MFN, I believe the broad array of interlocking human rights must not be overlooked or trivialized. Indeed, the lives and futures of many people depend on how well we utilize the considerable leverage at our disposal.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the President reported to Congress on June 3 that he had decided to continue MFN for Romania for another year. I think it is very significant, however, that he said he made this determination with difficulty and noted that he was "disappointed by the Romanian Government's very limited response to numerous expressions of strong United States public, congressional, and administration concern about its performance in areas of human rights and religious issues \* \* \*."

The President said he "share(s) the strong concerns manifested among the public and in Congress regarding the Romanian Government's restrictions on religious liberties." I know the chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, Mr. GIBBONS, and ranking member, Mr. FRENZEL, also share this concern.

Mr. Speaker, it is sad but true that the Communist authorities in Bucharest continue to restrict and control the right of religion, free speech, free assembly and association. Although Mr. GIBBONS pointed out that 174,000 Romanians have emigrated, the Romanian Government officially opposes emigration, erects substantial barriers to emigrating and there are numerous family reunification cases that still await resolution. Moreover, large numbers of emigrants begs the question of the status and quality of life inside Romania.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, let me note with guarded optimism recent progress in solving some of the hard emigration cases—progress that I hope is not intended just to coincide with our Government's review of MFN.

Just prior to the June 3 decision, Bucharest officials indicated that over 1,000 of the 1,800 pending emigration cases would be solved. Several religious prisoners have been released from jail over the last few months and are emigrating to the West, including Constantin Sfatcu, Dorel Catarama, and Emil Moranu. In March, Beni and Buni Cocar, both Baptist ministers who had been continually harassed for their faith, and then efforts to promote the Gospel of Christ were given their walking papers and are now in the United States. Of course, we all celebrated when Father Calciu, who had been imprisoned a total of 20 years, was allowed to emigrate to the United States last summer.

Clearly these developments can be construed as limited progress but many of us who are deeply committed to this cause fear that one MFN is assured for another year, the Romanians may, as the United States Helsinki Watch Committee puts it, "lapse back into its previous disregard for human rights \* \* \*."

That, Mr. Speaker, must not be permitted to happen and all of us, together, can be instrumental in seeing that it does not. This is not a game. I urge that my colleagues vote to discharge House Resolution 475 so we can delve further into this issue.

□ 1320

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the privileged motion of the gentleman from Illinois, and in support of the motion of the gentleman from Florida to lay the privileged motion on the table.

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has spent considerable time over the last several months in hearings with the Department of State and other agencies and individuals examining carefully the domestic situation in Romania and United States-Romanian relations.

My conclusions are: There is harsh domestic repression in Romania and there are many human rights violations. But despite these serious problems, it is in our national interest to extend MFN status to Romania for the coming year in order to try to work with Romania on these issues which are of deep concern to many of us in the Congress.

Therefore, I urge support of the President's decision of June 3, 1986, for several reasons:

First, on the narrow legal criterion of the 1974 Trade Act and Jackson-Vanik amendment which ties Romania's MFN status to emigration, Romania has been fairly responsive. During the 11 years of MFN status for Romania, over 150,000 persons have emigrated from Romania. One out of every 160 Romanians has emigrated legally.

Second, the record of 11 years of annual MFN review has provided leverage over Romania on human rights and other issues. We have had success under present policies. Our ability to continue to try to resolve 4,000 pending reunification cases concerning emigration to the United States will depend in large measure on a continuation of those policies. It is my understanding that close to half of these 4,000 cases are on their way to resolution. We hope to try to make further progress on these issues, and to keep the door open for appeals on specific cases. Denial of MFN at this time would complicate the United States ability to influence further decisions in Bucharest and would allow a difficult situation to worsen because there would be less incentive and less pressure on Romania to resolve problems.

Third, the political situation in Romania is fragile. There are likely to be some leadership changes in the Romanian Government soon. If we are entering a transition period, and the consensus is that we could be, the United States has an interest in maximizing its leverage in this period. MFN is the primary way we can do that. It will enable the United States to be a more effective player during any transition period when forces for evolutionary change in Romania are likely to become prominent. It is not in our interest to cut ourselves out of competition for influence in Romania at a time when we know the Soviets will be pressing hard. We should allow Romania an opportunity to resolve its problems with the West, and give it a way to work out its problems.

Fourth, Romania has a unique foreign and international security policy which the United States has an interest in supporting and promoting. Even though its foreign policy is circumscribed by reason of geographic and other circumstances, Romania has maintained good relations with Israel, China, West Germany, and the United States. Romania's Warsaw Pact military participation is limited. It is the only Warsaw Pact country to conduct more than 50 percent of its trade with the non-Communist world.

Fifth, MFN status for Romania has brought clear economic advantages to the United States. Over the past 11 years, United States companies have sold \$3.5 billion of goods to Romania;



10,000 jobs depend on U.S. exports to Romania, jobs that might otherwise go to Japan and Western Europe. Romania today remains as big a market for United States firms as Austria, and bigger than Finland or Greece. If Romania were to lose MFN status, it would cost Romania \$300 million, less than 5 percent of its hard currency earnings. Clearly denying MFN represents high costs to the United States for limited impact on Romania.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that not all the evidence supports my conclusion. Serious persecution in Romania of small denominations of Christian believers, interference with individual freedoms and political suppression are deeply offensive. But on balance my judgment is that MFN status for Romania is appropriate. Our ability to address our concerns in Romania and to help many individuals is enhanced by the annual review of MFN status. There may come a point where our ability to use this annual review as leverage is diminished or lost. But that point is not now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat this motion.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER].

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose granting MFN to Romania and rise to speak in favor of Mr. CRANE's resolution to disapprove the President's waiver request.

What are my reasons? Romania has perhaps the worst human rights record in all of Eastern Europe. In the words of former U.S. Ambassador David Fun-derburk:

Romania's abysmal record on human rights and its lack of internal reforms are a mockery of declared U.S. policy goals.

It is a regime that has instituted total censorship of mail coming from outside the country. It is a regime that monitors all international telephone calls. It is a regime that supports international terrorism and runs paramilitary training schools and gives support to the PLO. It is a regime that kills clergy, bulldozes churches and has even turned Bibles into toilet paper. It is a regime that denies true religious freedom and, according to the latest report from Helsinki Watch, one which uses the clergy as policemen. It is a regime that harasses and oppresses those who wish to emigrate—sometimes even depriving them of their apartments, their jobs, their ration cards, and their schooling. It is a regime which has ordered its intelligence service to savagely beat and even assassinate Romanians abroad who have criticized the Romanian Government. It is a regime which ordered the removal of "all but a few token Jews" from military and security forces and from sensitive Government positions.

Believe me, this is only a small recitation of what is a very long list of evil behavior by that regime. The Ceausescu regime is also engaged in a campaign of harassment and discrimination of the large Hungarian minority in Romania. The Romanian Government is intent on systematically eliminating any traces of the Hungarian language and culture. As an example, according to Helsinki Watch, all Hungarian language broadcasting is no longer allowed and a decree was recently passed which limited the number of Hungarian-speaking students at the University of Cluj to 5 percent—it had been 65 percent until that time.

Mr. Speaker, I have a wealth of additional information on the abuses of the Ceausescu regime for any Member who wishes to contact my office. Let me close by saying that I fail to see how any of my colleagues could support such a regime through the granting of MFN. In my view, and in the view of others, such action by our country makes a mockery of America's support of human rights.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER].

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

On Tuesday, June 3, President Reagan transmitted to the Congress his decision to continue the waiver authority currently in effect under sections 402(a) and 402(b) of the Trade Act of 1974.

In addition, the President transmitted his determination that continuation of the waiver applicable to the Socialist Republic of Romania will substantially promote the objectives of the act.

In his report to Congress, President Reagan notes that progress has been made in resolving many of the concerns of those who have challenged Romania's MFN status. According to the President, emigration from Romania has increased substantially in the 10 years since the waiver authority has been in effect. The Romanian Government's implementation of new procedures for emigration from Romania to the United States has reduced the hardships previously imposed on such emigres. And the Romanian Government has continued to honor its commitment that it would not require reimbursement of education costs as a precondition of emigration.

While the President's transmission does note that progress remains to be made in the area of religious liberties, the President concludes that extension of Romania's MFN status will "... enable us to have an impact on human rights concerns and to help to strengthen the extent of religious observance in Romania."

I concur in his determination. Indeed, notwithstanding the alleged

efforts of the Romanian Government to suppress the free expression of religious values by its people, the President has concluded that the widespread practice of religion in Romania, especially among the Protestant denominations, is growing faster than in other Communist-bloc nations.

I am also concerned that suspension or revocation of Romania's MFN status could substantially reduce coal mining and export opportunities in Virginia.

Since 1977 the Government of Romania has invested over \$60 million in the development of a joint coal mining venture with Island Creek Coal Co. The agreement provides for the exportation of 14 million tons of coal from the Garden Creek Pocahontas Coal Co. mine in Buchanan County, VA, to Romania over a 35-year period—1980–2015. The mine was developed expressly for the sales to Romania. In 1986, Garden Creek will deliver 500,000 tons of coal with a delivered value of \$25 million to Romania. Hereafter, Romania will purchase approximately 35 to 40 percent of Garden Creek's mine production until the year 2015.

The Garden Creek Pocahontas Coal Co. employs approximately 255 miners and 55 supervisory personnel in Buchanan County where the unemployment rate hovers in the 20- to 25-percent range. With an annual payroll of approximately \$12 million, secondary employment effects are substantial. In addition to the important role that Garden Creek has played in Buchanan County generating jobs and revenues, all of Garden Creek's coal is shipped on the Norfolk Southern railway, providing over \$18 million per year in revenue to Norfolk Southern. Most of Garden Creek's coal is exported through the Norfolk Southern coal piers at Norfolk, VA.

The economic benefits of Island Creek's joint venture with the Romanian Government stretch from one end of Virginia to the other. Hundreds of coal miners and railroad and port workers depend on this venture as the source of their employment, and communities from Appalachia to the Atlantic benefit from the economy activity generated by the mining, transportation and shipment of Virginia coal to Romania.

I am concerned that should Romania's MFN status be suspended or revoked, they will turn to cheaper European sources of coal to meet their import needs.

Romania's decision to invest \$60 million in Buchanan County, VA, was not made solely on the basis of the economic advantages of mining and importing Virginia coal. Romania's investment reflects, to a large extent, their good faith efforts to make trade between our two nation's a two-way street. Should the flow of Romanian

products to the United States be cut or halted as a result of the suspension or revocation of MFN status, Romania will no longer have the incentive or the dollars to import our coal. That could deal a devastating blow to Buchanan County with ripple effects throughout the State.

I share President Reagan's view that we will continue to see improvements in the Romanian Government's treatment of minority religious groups if we continue the mutually beneficial flow of commerce between our two nations. Romania has responded, albeit slower than you and I might like, to our Nation's ongoing expression of concern regarding their immigration policy. In addition, Romania has distinguished itself as the only Warsaw Pact nation which attended the Los Angeles Olympics and which does not participate in the Warsaw Pact's joint military exercises.

I believe that we can achieve both of our goals through cooperation rather than confrontation. Continuing our mutually beneficial trade relationship with Romania and continuing to bring diplomatic pressure on the Romanian Government to expand religious liberty go hand-in-hand.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY].

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion of the gentleman from Illinois and against the motion to table.

Mr. Speaker, ever since I was first elected to this House in 1980 I have attempted to have this body do something about the fact that the United States continues to grant most-favored-nation trading status to the Communist regime of Romania. Today I hope we will finally have a chance to act and to go on the record as to our concern about religious and national persecution in Romania.

I will support the discharge motion to allow House Resolution 475 to the floor for a vote. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in proving to ourselves and to the whole world that we stand by the principles of America in our relations with all nations of the world.

We have imposed sanctions, embargoed and passed resolutions against many countries and many forms of human rights abuses. Romania is high on the list of human rights violators and it is past time for this House to reaffirm our belief and commitment to our principles and deny most-favored-nation status to Romania.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RUDD].

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, under the 1974 Trade Act, Communist countries that restrict emigration cannot be granted most-favored-nation status unless the President issues a waiver on the ground that emigration curbs

have been relaxed. The time has come for Congress to override the President's waiver for Romania. Romania is a Communist nation that has intimate Soviet connections, blatant human rights abuses, and direct links to terrorism.

The people of Romania suffer under one of the most repressive regimes in the world. The Romanian security personnel have 1 agent for every 15 citizens—the world's highest ratio of security agents. However, Romania needs this excessive manpower to handle its censorship activities. Every single letter and package from abroad is opened, and all international telephone calls are monitored.

Even with its most-favored-nation status, Romania has grown closer—if that is possible—to the Soviet Union. Trade between the Soviet Union and Romania has dramatically increased, and a top Romanian official recently stated that "closer bonds with the Soviet Union and total reintegration within the Warsaw Pact are inevitable, sooner or later." The Washington Times recently reported that 550 Soviet advisers regulate factories in Romania, many of which manufacture Soviet weapons for export to Third World countries.

The Romanian record on human rights is atrocious. The Romanian "victory of socialism" campaign has resulted in arbitrary arrests and beatings, false criminal charges, torture, prejudged trials, and the forced incarceration of Christian believers into insane asylums. Those who apply for emigration lose their jobs, and often large bribes are demanded from relatives living abroad before exit papers are issued.

Even more startling is the direct involvement of Romania in terrorist acts. Romania has collaborated with the PLO in operations against their opponents in the West, and Romania has been declared responsible for the bombing of Radio Free Europe's Munich headquarters in February 1981.

Romania is a hostile Communist regime that mocks the democratic principles for which the United States stands. Romania has repeatedly proven that they do not deserve a \$700 million trade subsidy. In the words of former U.S. Ambassador David Funderburk, "a regime that turns Bibles into toilet paper and bulldozes churches, does not deserve most-favored-nation status." I urge support of the motion and oppose the motion to table.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN].

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentleman from Illinois and in opposition to the motion to table.

Mr. Speaker, although I do so with some reluctance, I rise today to support the pending measure to deny most-favored-nation trading status for Romania. As a cosponsor of H.R. 3599, which would suspend MFN status for Romania for 6 months, I feel compelled to support the measure before us now.

In voicing my support for this proposal, let me note that there are some arguments for continuing "business as usual" with Romania. Although it is a

Warsaw Pact country, Romania must be considered something of a maverick within the Soviet bloc. It, alone among Soviet-dominated Eastern European nations, maintains relations with Israel. Of the Soviet bloc Communist countries, Romania has clearly been, relatively speaking, one of the most forthcoming on family-reunification cases.

My personal awareness of and involvement in two cases involving constituents, however, compels me to support this legislation. The first case involves Mr. Eugen Pincu, the former commercial attaché for the Romanian Government, who worked in New York City and lived there with his wife and daughter. In 1982, Romanian officials attempted to pressure him into engaging in espionage activities against the United States. He refused. Shortly thereafter he was summoned to Bucharest, the Romanian capital, for re-orientation. When he returned to Bucharest he was dismissed from his post and was informed that he would not be permitted to leave Romania again.

Mr. Pincu's wife and daughter, who did not join him on his trip back to Romania, subsequently refused to leave America. They were granted political asylum by the United States in July 1982.

Since his return to Bucharest, Mr. Pincu has repeatedly sought reunification with his family in America. Although United States authorities have approved his immigration request and have intervened on his behalf with the Romanian regime, the Romanians have repeatedly denied him an emigration visa. He has been forced to take a low-paying clerk-typist position, and been pressured to divorce his wife and sever all ties to her and their daughter, who now live in Philadelphia. Repeated efforts to resolve this situation—including numerous phone calls and letters to the Romanian Ambassador and letters to Romanian President Ceausescu—have been met with stony silence by the Romanian Government.

In the other case, that of Ms. Angela Novac of Lafayette Hill, PA, the Romanians have failed to act in a timely manner to allow her fiancé, Mr. Ioan Draghici, to emigrate here. Ms. Novac and Mr. Draghici first applied to Romanian authorities for permission to marry in 1984. Since my involvement in this case in March 1985, I have written to the Romanian Ambassador four times in an effort to resolve this matter. After three letters, I finally received a response—indicating the Embassy had referred the case to the appropriate authorities in Bucharest. That was in January 1986. I have heard nothing since.

Mr. Speaker, these events, coupled with the consistent pattern of Romanian human rights violations identified by our State Department and in-



dependent observers including Helsinki Watch, compel me to support the legislation before us. President Ceausescu should understand that Americans cannot and will not condone or ignore violations of human rights.

While Romania has not been the worst violator of human rights, its record is moving in the wrong direction. Support of this measure—even if it is unlikely to be enacted—will send a message that must be heard in Bucharest.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHUMWAY].

Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, while the United States generally grants most-favored-nation status [MFN] unconditionally to all trading partners, the granting of this trade preference to Communist countries is tied to their emigration policies. Under the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Act of 1974, Communist countries may be granted MFN status only if their emigration policy is relatively unrestricted.

The purpose of the Jackson-Vanik amendment is to "assure the continued dedication of the United States to fundamental human rights \* \* \*." Specifically, the amendment establishes minimum standards for emigration policy in recognition of the inherent right of an individual to leave a country.

If a country is in substantial compliance with the Jackson-Vanik provisions, the President may request the authority to waive their application with respect to that country. For the past 10 years Romania has been granted MFN status on the basis of such a waiver. In my view, it is time to take a hard look at the policies of the Romanian Government and discontinue this charade.

For the past decade we have rewarded Romania for its independence from the Soviet Union. Romania does not participate in joint Warsaw Pact exercises and refuses to allow Soviet troops to hold these exercises on its soil. Romania is the only Eastern-bloc nation to maintain relations with Israel. The Romanian Government criticized the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and participated in the Los Angeles Olympic games despite a Soviet boycott.

At the same time, the Romanian Government, the fifth leading arms exporter, serves as a training ground for terrorists. According to Gen. Ion Pacepa, Romanian Foreign Intelligence Director until his defection in 1978, Romania trains members of Western Communist parties in sabotage, diversion and guerrilla tactics. Romania provides political and material support to the PLO and its terrorist factions, as well as secretly cooperating with Libyan security forces. General Pacepa also stated that "Mr. Ceausescu serves as a conduit for the transmission of embargoed Western technology to Moscow." (Wall Street Journal, January 13, 1986, p. 86)

Romania's human rights record is as disconcerting as its support for terrorism. Last year David Funderburk, former United States Ambassador to Romania, concluded that, "Romania's abysmal record on human rights

and its lack of internal reforms are a mockery of declared U.S. policy goals."

The Romanian Government controls every aspect of religious activities from the printing and distribution of religious materials to the salaries of the clergy and the number of admissions to the seminaries. A request by Baptist ministers to print more Bibles, train more ministers and manage church funds without State control was denounced as antistate provocation. Churches have been demolished for petty building code infractions, such as a construction error of 1 meter. Persons who belong to churches other than the 14 recognized by the State may be arrested for disturbing the peace or unlawful assemblies. Religious leaders are subject to imprisonment and in some cases death. Rev. Giza Palfi, arrested for his Christmas sermon in 1983 opposing a government edict making Christmas an ordinary work day, was severely beaten and died 2 months later.

Romanians who wish to leave their country must be prepared to pay a price. The bribes extracted for exit papers range from 4,000 marks for a child to 10,000 for an adult. The Ceausescu regime also collects 7,900 marks from the West German Government for each ethnic German allowed to emigrate to West Germany. Persons wishing to emigrate must sell all of their real property at low, fixed government rates. In addition, no money may be taken out of the country.

The emigration process is lengthy and approval is not assured. In the meantime, applicants may suffer demotion or dismissal from jobs, dismissal from universities, eviction from apartments, denial of ration cards, and loss of citizenship which are all common government responses. Persons wishing to leave Romania become in effect exiles within their own country.

Romania has enjoyed MFN status for the past 10 years. During this time the persecution and restricted emigration policies have continued. Indeed the only change over the past decade has been an increasing trade deficit with Romania which exported almost \$1 billion in goods to the United States in 1985, including \$134 million in duty free imports, creating a deficit of over \$700 million.

Romania, a country which trains terrorists and exacts a very high price from those who wish to emigrate, does not deserve the trade preferences of MFN.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague of the Subcommittee on Trade, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHULZE].

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my colleague's motion to discharge House Resolution 475 from the Committee on Ways and Means for consideration by the Committee of the Whole House.

Under the provisions of the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Act of 1974, Congress mandated that most-favored-nation treatment for nonmarket economy countries be predicated on the existence of freedom of emigration from these countries. In the case of Romania, it is clear that the Romanian Government has not upheld its

obligations called for under these provisions. To make matters worse, the United States Government annually condones Romania's notorious record on emigration by waiving the full requirements of Jackson-Vanik.

Just the fact that the number of Romanians allowed to emigrate in 1985 declined by 18.5 percent compared to 1984 demonstrates the unsupportability of continued MFN status for Romania.

Perhaps more important than mere numbers is the cold disregard for the basic human rights of those Romanians who apply to emigrate. Undue hardship and harassment, frequently leading to job demotion and dismissal, apartment eviction, and general ostracism by society, are synonymous with emigration. Obstacles are confronted every step of the way by those who wish to leave Romania. Examples of such obstacles range from inordinate delays in processing application forms to outright bribery.

And finally, Romania needs to realize once and for all that MFN is a privilege which carries with it responsibility. I would argue that in the trade arena Romania has been nothing but irresponsible. Not only does the Romanian Government fail to adhere to the emigration standards set forth under our trade laws, Romania continues to trade unfairly by dumping steel, shoes and textile and apparel products. This has caused irreparable harm to our Nation's manufacturing sector, and only continues to increase our trade deficit with Romania, which amounted to \$743 million in 1985.

I remain convinced more than ever that MFN status must be revoked from Romania, at least temporarily, to ensure that emigration policies are promoted openly and responsibly, and to convince the Romania Government that its unfair trade practices will not go unnoticed. Thus, I strongly urge that my colleagues support the motion now before us.

□ 1335

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BONKER], the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, I really share the concerns of those who are bringing this resolution to the House floor today, because anyone who knows anything about Romania knows that it is one of the most repressive governments anywhere in the world today, and that the Ceausescu regime is against all the tenets of freedom and liberty and democracy that we feel are important.

The concern here is how we best approach this issue. I do not believe that bringing House Resolution 475 to the

floor today is the best approach to deal with the problem.

The Jackson-Vanik amendment grants preferential trade credits on the basis of emigration policy. It is not a general human rights program.

Let me cite from section 402 of the Trade Act of 1974, which explicitly ties the granting of MFN to a country's performance on emigration only, not a general status of respect for human rights.

\*\*\* products from any nonmarket economy country shall be eligible to receive MFN \*\*\* if the President reports to Congress that he has received assurances that the emigration practices of that country will henceforth lead substantially to the achievement of the objectives of this section.

We are attempting to be consistent with the law that this Congress has lead out, and the President is attempting to meet the spirit and the letter of that law.

When Mr. GIBBONS, the chairman, and Mr. FRENZEL and Mr. LANTOS and I were in Romania a few years ago, there was a different problem, and it also was emigration. It involved an education tax on everybody who wanted to leave the country. They would have to pay back to the Government all of the cost of their education. Now that smacked at the emigration policy. I recall the gentlemen who are here this afternoon who were in that meeting pressing Ceausescu, even threatening him, on MFN if he were to continue with that onerous policy. He subsequently withdrew the policy, and again met the basic test of MFN, the Jackson-Vanik amendment.

My concern here is if we bring this resolution to the floor and actually override the President's waiver, we will have set a new precedent for dealing with human rights problems.

You say, well we ought to have leverage for dealing with human rights. I rather imagine that if we were to attempt an MFN standard on human rights practices around the world, somewhere between 120 and 125 countries would be involved.

We do have a human rights policy in the Foreign Assistance Act. I would have to say that if we were to engage this issue, the Committee on Foreign Affairs ought to have some jurisdiction, because that is the committee which deals basically with human rights policy in section 16(c) of that act.

So we are talking about preferential trade agreements, we are talking about emigration and we are talking about human rights, but we do not need to necessarily mix them. If we want to greatly expand our human rights policy so that we use MFN as a leverage, then we ought to deal with that more broadly and not narrowly with one country like Romania.

Mr. Speaker, again, I support those who have expressed concern over the repression that exists in that country. I have been there and I have seen the repression. But I think that we need to approach this issue responsibly and in a way that is consistent with U.S. law.

I would side with those human rights groups that feel that while the human rights abuses there are very serious, that this is not the way to deal with the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we support the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] to table House Resolution 475.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DENNY SMITH].

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the action of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 475, offered by the gentleman from Illinois. Although I am normally supportive of the administration's foreign policy, flagrant and persistent human rights violations in Romania have gone unheeded for far too long.

Romania's MFN status has been renewed every year since 1974, despite its deplorable human rights record. This trade benefit has not helped the Romanian people. Nor has the United States benefited; we had a \$743.3 million trade deficit with Romania in 1985. Only the repressive Ceausescu regime has reaped the economic benefits that accompany MFN status, since the state controls the economy.

Under the provisions of the Trade Act of 1974, MFN status for a Communist country is closely linked to that nation's emigration policies. Romania's policies in years past have been costly and obstructionist. Even now, family reunification remains difficult. Demotion or firing, expulsion from universities, eviction from apartments, denial of ration cards, and loss of citizenship are all common government responses to those who seek to emigrate.

Other human rights violations are rampant, even though Romania is a signatory of the Helsinki human rights accords. Those who practice their religious beliefs are continually harassed, churches are demolished for minute building code infractions, and several clergymen have died during or shortly after interrogation. Bibles that were legally imported were used by the government to make toilet paper. In addition, harsh treatment of the Hungarian minority continues unabated.

The time has come to stand up for the human rights aspirations of the Romanian people. We must vote to deny MFN status. Otherwise it will appear to the Ceausescu regime that there is little chance MFN status will ever be withdrawn. Each year—as the time for MFN renewal approaches—a few concessions are made, persecution of religious groups eases, and emigration increases slightly. Unfortunately, after years of deceit, many remain blind to the cyclical nature of these paltry symbolic concessions, and MFN status has always been approved. Once ap-

proval is given, repression and harassment resume.

If the granting of MFN status is to be an effective foreign policy tool, it must be withdrawn from Romania now. Only then will the United States be taken seriously when it offers trade concessions to Communist regimes in exchange for human rights and emigration reform. I urge all of my colleagues who share my concern for human rights to vote for adoption of this resolution.

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayer is expected to do many things by many people, in and out of Government. Those who would support most-favored-nation status for Romania are asking the American taxpayer to subsidize a brutally repressive regime. This has been said many times before but for once we must be willing to stop putting the taxpayer's money where our mouths are.

In 1985, the United States ran a trade deficit of well over \$700 million with the Communist Government of Romania. Under the program of most-favored-nation status, many Romanian products were shipped to the United States duty-free. So not only are we running a substantial trade deficit, we are expected to forgo normal import fees, thus contributing even further to our domestic deficit.

This would be a wrong-headed policy if we were talking about an allied democracy, but it becomes truly absurd when we allow a Communist dictatorship to take advantage of our trade policies without so much as a hint of a change in its emigration restrictions.

The burden of proof should not be upon those of us who oppose most-favored-nation status for Romania. Let those who see some improvement in the plight of the Romanian people stand here before us and show how the situation has been bettered by 10 years of most-favored-nation status. Let them respond to the Helsinki Watch Human Rights Committee when it states that Romania is one of the worst offenders of human rights in Eastern Europe. Let them respond to the thousands of Romanians who will never be allowed to leave that conquered land for freedom. Let them explain why the United States should help support a Soviet puppet that has not complied with any of the Jackson-Vanik requirements. And after they have spoken here, let them explain it to the American taxpayer.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, no consideration of human rights abuses in Romania would be complete without mentioning the Hungarian minority in that country.

The repression of the 2.5 million Hungarian nationals in Romania, who constitute more than 10 percent of the population, continues unabated. In fact, according to testimony in congressional hearings, this repression is on the rise; in recent years, all television broadcasting in Hungarian has been stopped and Hungarian schools are being closed.

According to the State Department's Country Report on Human Rights, "In 1985 there were frequent reports of confiscations of foreign-source materials, including Hungarian-language publications, at the border \* \* \*." In 1985 there was reportedly an increase in the number of books banned or restricted.

Since 1975, when the United States granted most-favored-nation status to Romania, it has



become increasingly clear that the goal of the Romanian Government is to destroy the very fabric of the cultural and religious life of its Hungarian citizens.

Just as the United States Government expresses its concerns for oppressed minorities in countries around the world—the Jews of the Soviet Union, the Tamil Separatists in Sri Lanka, the Sikhs of India—so must we continue to speak out on behalf of the Hungarians in Romania.

To continue to reward Romania with trade concessions while its government denies its minorities the most basic of human rights is wrong. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to send a message of hope to the beleaguered Hungarian minority and suspend MFN status for Romania.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to the motion of my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE], and in support of President Reagan's decision to extend most-favored-nation status to Romania for another year.

No one in this Chamber can deny that Romania has an abysmal record on human rights. The issue, however, is not the human rights situation per se, but what good can be accomplished by our continuing imposition of trade restrictions on Romania; also we seek to improve Romanian emigration and its human rights policies.

Romania of late has been fairly responsive on emigration issues, especially family reunification cases. We have been able to make some progress on certain specific abuses of human rights. The political situation in Romania is subject to change, with the current leadership aging and under stress. It is therefore important that we should maintain our ties to the Romanian Government in order to have some access should a leadership change occur. Romania's current foreign policy of good relations with the United States, Israel, China, and West Germany, and of only limited participation in the Warsaw Pact, is of importance to our Nation.

By tabling this motion, we are not indicating our support for the intolerant aspects of Romania's policies. Rather, we are maintaining a weapon to blunt those policies in important respects. Let us discard that weapon.

Accordingly, I urge support for the motion to table the motion to discharge.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard commentary on some of the economic aspects of this relationship that we have with Romania. I think it is important to again harken back to Gen. Ion Pa-cepa's comments as they appeared in the Wall Street Journal.

"Mr. Ceausescu," as he indicated, "serves as a conduit for the transmission of embargoed Western technology to Moscow."

Then the Free Romania in May of this year pointed out that Romania's economic ties to the Soviet Union have increased, so indirectly we are providing assistance to the Soviet economy.

In this year, Soviet technical aid projects in Romania grew to 41 under the newest 5-year plan. Plants produc-

ing steel, electrical power, rolling stock and aircraft are being equipped with Soviet machinery. More and more Romanian plants are becoming involved in joint production arrangements using Soviet technology. Romania has also emerged as a large-scale producer of Soviet types of armaments, both for export to Russia and to Russia's clients in the Third World and elsewhere.

Finally, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me again try to reframe the nature of this debate.

We have, theoretically, if my motion prevails, 20 hours allocated for debate. By a prior agreement, Mr. Speaker, I will make a unanimous-consent request if my motion prevails that that be limited to 1 hour.

Second, this is not a one-House veto. If we are going to overturn the President's action that has previously been taken, it would require companion action in the Senate, which is not contemplated, and the deadline for that action would be August 3; in any event, too short for Senate action.

What we are doing here is sending a message to those people who have been amongst the most flagrant violators of human rights, the Jackson-Vanik provisions with respect to freedom of emigration, people who have engaged in terrorist acts themselves, perpetrated by themselves, but who have also trained terrorists within their borders. These are people who have bulldozed churches and converted Bibles into toilet paper.

This, my colleagues in this body must recognize, is the only chance they are going to have to go on record and to be heard as far as having taken a public position on the issue.

I would urge all of my colleagues to vote against the motion to table and to support the resolution. It is a statement. It is a communication on this vital issue, this human rights question, and in fact is, as my colleague from Virginia noted earlier, probably the most meaningful human rights vote that this body will have the opportunity to take this year.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the motion to table and to support my resolution.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, many of the major human rights groups in the United States who are involved with this issue supports the motion I am about to make to table the Crane motion.

The President of the United States supports the motion. The Secretary of State supports the motion. The Secretary of Commerce supports the motion. Most of the major Jewish organizations in the United States agree with the motion I am about to make. Most of the major Christian organizations agree with that position.

#### PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. GIBBONS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NATCHER). The Clerk will report the preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GIBBONS moves to lay the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 190, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 255]

YEAS—216

Ackerman	Evans (IA)	Lightfoot
Anderson	Evans (IL)	Lipinski
Andrews	Fascell	Loeffler
Annunzio	Fazio	Long
Anthony	Flippo	Lowry (WA)
Archer	Florio	Lukens
Aspin	Foley	Lundine
Atkins	Ford (MI)	MacKay
AuCoin	Frank	Manton
Bateman	Frenzel	Markey
Bates	Frost	Martin (IL)
Bedell	Fuqua	Martinez
Beilenson	Garcia	Matsui
Bennett	Gejdenson	Mavroules
Bereuter	Gephardt	Mazzoli
Berman	Gibbons	McCollum
Biaggi	Gilman	McHugh
Boland	Glickman	McKinney
Bonior (MI)	Gonzalez	Meyers
Bonker	Gordon	Mica
Borski	Gradison	Michel
Bosco	Gray (IL)	Mikulski
Boucher	Gray (PA)	Miller (CA)
Boxer	Guarini	Mineta
Brooks	Hamilton	Mitchell
Brown (CA)	Hatcher	Moody
Bruce	Hawkins	Morrison (CT)
Burton (CA)	Hayes	Natcher
Bustamante	Hillis	Oaker
Carper	Horton	Oberstar
Chappell	Howard	Obey
Clay	Hoyer	Olin
Clinger	Hughes	Ortiz
Coleman (MO)	Jacobs	Owens
Combest	Jeffords	Panetta
Conte	Johnson	Pease
Conyers	Jones (NC)	Penny
Cooper	Jones (OK)	Pepper
Coyne	Jones (TN)	Perkins
Craig	Kaptur	Petri
Daschle	Kastenmeier	Pickle
de la Garza	Kennelly	Price
Dellums	Kildee	Rahall
Dicks	Kleczka	Rangel
Dingell	Kolter	Richardson
Dixon	LaFalce	Roberts
Donnelly	Lantos	Rodino
Dorgan (ND)	Leach (IA)	Roe
Dowdy	Lehman (CA)	Rostenkowski
Downey	Lehman (FL)	Roukema
Dymally	Leland	Rowland (CT)
Edgar	Lent	Rowland (GA)
Edwards (CA)	Levin (MI)	Russo
English	Levine (CA)	Sabo

Savage  
Scheuer  
Schneider  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Seiberling  
Sharp  
Shaw  
Shelby  
Sikorski  
Slisisky  
Skellton  
Slatery  
Smith (FL)  
Smith (IA)  
Smith (NE)  
Solarz  
Solomon

St Germain  
Staggers  
Stallings  
Stangeland  
Stark  
Stokes  
Stratton  
Studds  
Swift  
Synar  
Tauke  
Thomas (CA)  
Thomas (GA)  
Torres  
Torrice  
Torrice  
Traficant  
Vander Jagt  
Vento

Visclosky  
Waldon  
Waxman  
Weber  
Weiss  
Wheat  
Whitehurst  
Whitten  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wirth  
Wise  
Wolpe  
Wright  
Wyden  
Wylie  
Yates  
Zschau

## NAYS—190

Akaka  
Alexander  
Applegate  
Arney  
Badham  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bentley  
Bevill  
Bilirakis  
Billey  
Boehlert  
Boggs  
Bonner (TN)  
Boulter  
Breaux  
Broomfield  
Brown (CO)  
Bryant  
Burton (IN)  
Byron  
Callahan  
Carr  
Chandler  
Chapman  
Chapple  
Cheney  
Coats  
Cobey  
Coble  
Coleman (TX)  
Coughlin  
Courter  
Crane  
Daniel  
Dannemeyer  
Darden  
Daub  
Davis  
DeLay  
DeWine  
Dickinson  
DioGuardi  
Dorman (CA)  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Durbin  
Dwyer  
Dyson  
Early  
Eckart (OH)  
Eckart (NY)  
Edwards (OK)  
Emerson  
Erdreich  
Fawell  
Fiedler  
Fields  
Fish  
Franklin  
Gallo  
Gaydos  
Gekas  
Gingrich  
Goodling

Green  
Gregg  
Hall (OH)  
Hall, Ralph  
Hammerschmidt  
Hansen  
Hefner  
Hendon  
Henry  
Hertel  
Hiller  
Holt  
Hopkins  
Hubbard  
Huckaby  
Hunter  
Hutto  
Hyde  
Ireland  
Jenkins  
Kanjorski  
Kasich  
Kemp  
Kindness  
Kolbe  
Kramer  
Lagomarsino  
Latta  
Leath (TX)  
Lewis (CA)  
Livingston  
Lloyd  
Lott  
Lowery (CA)  
Lujan  
Lungren  
Mack  
Madigan  
Martin (NY)  
McCain  
McCandless  
McCloskey  
McCurdy  
McDade  
McEwen  
McGrath  
McKernan  
McMillan  
Miller (OH)  
Miller (WA)  
Molinar  
Monson  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Morrison (WA)  
Mrazek  
Murphy  
Murtha  
Myers  
Neal  
Nelson  
Nichols  
Nielson  
Nowak  
Oxley

Packard  
Pashayan  
Porter  
Pursell  
Quillen  
Ray  
Regula  
Reid  
Ridge  
Rinaldo  
Ritter  
Robinson  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Rose  
Roth  
Roybal  
Rudd  
Saxton  
Schaefer  
Schuette  
Schulze  
Sensenbrenner  
Shumway  
Shuster  
Siljander  
Skeen  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith, Denny  
(OR)  
Smith, Robert  
(NH)  
Smith, Robert  
(OR)  
Snow  
Snyder  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stenholm  
Strang  
Stump  
Sundquist  
Sweeney  
Swindall  
Tallon  
Tauzin  
Taylor  
Traxler  
Valentine  
Volkmer  
Vucanovich  
Walgren  
Walker  
Watkins  
Whitley  
Whittaker  
Wolf  
Wortley  
Yatron  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (MO)

## NOT VOTING—25

Barnard  
Barnes  
Campbell  
Carney  
Coelho  
Collins  
Crockett  
Derrick  
Feighan

Fogletta  
Ford (TN)  
Fowler  
Grotberg  
Gunderson  
Hartnett  
Kosmayer  
Lewis (FL)  
Marlenee

Moakley  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Parris  
Towns  
Udall  
Weaver

□ 1355

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Barnard for, with Mr. Lewis of Florida against.

Mr. MRAZEK and Mr. REID changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. WEBER, CONYERS, STANGELAND, ANDREWS, PEASE, SKELTON, BOLAND, FLIPPO, STAGGERS, and HAYES changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So the preferential motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## NATIONAL FOREST SKI AREA PERMIT ACT OF 1986

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4489) to provide for ski areas on national forest lands, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4489

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Forest Ski Area Permit Act of 1986".

## SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

- (a) provide a unified and modern permitting process for nordic and alpine ski areas on national forest lands;
- (b) provide for ski area permits which more closely reflect the acreage and other physical requirements of modern ski area development; and
- (c) provide a permit system which will be more commensurate with the long-term construction, financing, and operation needs of ski areas on national forest lands.

## SEC. 3. SKI AREA PERMITS.

(a) LAW APPLICABLE TO PERMITS.—The provisions of the Act of March 4, 1915 (16 U.S.C. 497) notwithstanding, the term and acreage of permits for the operation of nordic and alpine ski areas and facilities on National Forest System lands shall henceforth be governed by this Act and other applicable law.

(b) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as "the Secretary"), subject to such reasonable terms, conditions, and permit fees as he deems appropriate, is hereby authorized to issue permits (hereinafter referred to as "ski area permits") for the use and occupancy of suitable lands within the National Forest System for nordic and alpine skiing operations and purposes. A ski area permit—

(1) may be issued for a term not to exceed 40 years;

(2) shall ordinarily be issued for a term of 40 years (unless the Secretary determines that the facilities or operations are of a scale or nature as are not likely to require long-term financing or operation), or that there are public policy reasons specific to a particular permit for a shorter term;

(3) shall encompass such acreage as the Secretary determines sufficient and appro-

priate to accommodate the permittee's need for ski operations and appropriate ancillary facilities;

(4) may be renewed at the discretion of the Secretary;

(5) may be canceled by the Secretary in whole or in part for any violation of the permit terms or conditions, for nonpayment of permit fees, or upon the determination by the Secretary in his planning for the uses or the national forests that the permitted area is needed for higher public purposes; and

(6) may be modified from time to time by the Secretary to accommodate changes in plans or operations in accordance with the provisions of applicable law.

(c) RULES AND REGULATIONS.—Within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promulgate rules and regulations to implement the provisions of this Act, and shall, to the extent practicable and with the consent of existing permit holders, convert all existing ski area permits or leases on National Forest System lands into ski area permits which conform to the provisions of this Act within 3 years of the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to amend, modify or otherwise affect the Secretary's duties under the National Environmental Policy Act, or the Forest and Rangelands Renewable Resources Planning Act as amended by the National Forest Management Act, including his duties to involve the public in his decisionmaking and planning for the national forests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. NATCHER). Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. STRANG] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING].

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4489 would institute a modernized and streamlined system for issuing permits for ski areas to operate on our national forests.

There are 170 ski areas now using national forest lands, and they presently operate under a clumsy, two permit system that gives them a long-term permit for a very small part of the land they use, while allowing the use of the vast majority of their area under a permit which has to be renewed every year.

The ski industry fears that this system—based on a 1915 law—will impede their ability to finance the growth and improvement they need to meet the demand of the public for ski facilities in the future.

H.R. 4489 replaces the dual permits with a single, long-term permit of up to 40 years, which will allow the orderly, planned development of ski facilities on the public lands and help the permittees obtain financing from private parties for that purpose.



I want to emphasize that this bill is quite clear in not doing anything to reduce the environmental standards which proposed new ski facilities or new ski areas have to meet to get approval. The committee strongly supports the comprehensive analysis of the environmental impacts of such development, and vigorous efforts of the Forest Service, working with State and local officials, to hold these developments up to a high standard and to mitigate environmental impacts.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan bill with a long list of cosponsors, but I wish to particularly single out the author of the bill, Representative TIM WIRTH of Colorado, for his initiative and leadership on this bill. In addition, our colleagues on the committee, BILL RICHARDSON, RICK LEHMAN, and MIKE STRANG have been most helpful in working to arrive at a final product that all the sponsors of the bill can support. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. WIRTH].

□ 1410

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, initially I want to point out that this legislation has moved in a 120-day period of time from introduction to its debate here on the floor today. The expeditious handling of this legislation is a tribute to the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING] and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], and I want to express my thanks and those of all of the sponsors of the legislation for their great help.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITLEY], who have helped us get this bill through the Committee on Agriculture, and my colleagues from the Rocky Mountain region who have helped so much on the legislation, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. STRANG] and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Each year, Mr. Speaker, more and more Americans are using our great outdoors, and our national forests are certainly no exception. These forests are home to most of the ski areas of the West, and the use is remarkable. For example, last year, while 44 million tickets were sold to major league baseball, 55 million ski-lift tickets were sold.

Mr. Speaker, recreation and tourism is now the second largest industry in Colorado, surpassing both agriculture and mining. Skiing is a big part of that recreation industry. In Colorado alone, the ski industry generates 44,500 jobs and \$132 million in State and local taxes. Overall, this industry makes a

\$1.3 billion contribution to the State's economy.

On the western slope of the Rockies, the ski industry is even more important to the economy. In that part of my State, skiing accounts for a remarkable 25 percent of total employment, 32 percent of retail sales, 21 percent of personal income, and 45 percent of all housing construction.

Skiing is important to Colorado, as it is to other States in the Rocky Mountain West and other regions.

However, much of the land base that makes for good skiing is controlled by the Federal Government. As a result, 28 of the total 37 ski areas in Colorado operate on national forest land. Across the country, 170 ski areas rely on national forest lands.

H.R. 4489 was designed to modernize the ski area permitting process. Under current Federal law, ski area owners can get one 30-year permit for up to 80 acres of land. But virtually all ski areas are larger than that, many are much larger. As a result, they must also get a second permit for the rest of the ski area. And this second permit must be renewed every year.

This dual permit process imposes an unnecessary regulatory burden on ski areas. More important, the 1-year permit makes it difficult for ski area operators to raise the capital they need to make the improvements that are absolutely necessary to keep our ski areas safe and world competitive.

H.R. 4489 solves this problem by providing for one consolidated permit for the entire area that is necessary to operate a ski area within a national forest. It also reflects the current financial realities by extending the maximum permit term to 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, this bill responds to a very real problem that confronts the 170 ski areas that operate within the national forests. At the same time, this bill does not reduce our commitment to protecting and enhancing wildlife habitat, fishing streams, and the scenic vista that are an integral part of an American family's ski vacation.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill for Colorado and other States in which skiing is an important part of their economies. It provides much-needed reform without detracting at all from the other purposes for which national forests are, and must be, managed. I urge our colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the subcommittee chairman for his expeditious handling of H.R. 4489, the National Ski Area Permit Act of 1986. As you know, skiing is an integral part of our economy in Colorado. Anything we can do to encourage future development and protect existing ski areas is welcomed by the people of Colorado

as well as the thousands of recreationists from all over the country who enjoy skiing.

As you know, skiing provides more recreation on less public land than any other type of recreational activity. Commercial alpine and nordic ski operators occupy less than five one hundredths of 1 percent of all national forest land, but account for almost 6 percent of current overall national forest visitor use. I know of no other recreational pursuit that includes more members of the family—that is more healthful and promotes an appreciation of the outdoors—that generates more revenues for the Forest Service and does it on such a tiny area of land.

According to the 1985 update of "The Contribution of Skiing to the Colorado Economy," the ski industry represents the largest single industry on Colorado's western slope. The industry supports over 44,500 jobs and generates over \$1.3 billion per year in retail sales. In 1985, 9 million skiers visited Colorado and spent nearly \$800 million. State and local tax receipts added up to \$132 million.

I think you get my point—skiing is very important to the western slope and to Colorado. I know that is also important to my colleagues from Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, Utah, Nevada, and New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman stated, H.R. 4489 will help to change the Forest Service's antiquated method of issuing permits for ski area developments.

Currently, the Forest Service can only issue a permit for up to 80 acres for a 30-year period. If a permittee needs additional acreage for the existing ski area or needs more than 80 acres for the initial area, he must apply for a second permit which is good for 1 year at a time.

As we discovered in the hearing on H.R. 4489, investors are often reluctant to lend substantial amounts of money for developments that are permitted for 1 year even when those permits are normally renewed automatically. The ski industry originally requested changing the permit system to one permit of up to 55 years to eliminate some of the uncertainty associated with obtaining financial commitment for ski areas developments. Although the Forest Service supported the consolidation of permits, it objected to the 55-year permit of the original legislation. I believe 55 years is a reasonable request, however, the Forest Service and the ski industry support a compromise of 40 years. Therefore, in spirit of compromise, I along with other members of the Interior Committee support the 40-year compromise.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I know that 21 million skiers who made over 51 million visits to ski areas in this country

last year will appreciate what we have done here today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHUMWAY].

Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues today in strong support of H.R. 4489, the National Forest Ski Area Permit Act of 1986. This sensible measure, introduced by my colleagues Mr. MICHAEL STRANG and Mr. TIM WIRTH, would authorize the U.S. Forest Service to issue unified 40-year leases for alpine and nordic winter ski resorts utilizing national forest lands.

As a result of provisions in the act of March 4, 1915, modern ski areas still operate under an antiquated dual permit system which limits long-term permits for use and occupancy of national forest lands to areas no greater than 80 acres and for periods no longer than 30 years. Thus, the Forest Service has administered recreational ski development under the 1915 act by issuing a single long-term permit pursuant to the act for 80 acres encompassing the most capital-intensive improvements—ski lifts, lodges and the like—while making available the balance of the area—including trails and slopes that can cover as much as 10,000 acres—under 1-year permits issued under the authority of the Organic Administration Act of 1897.

While the dual permit system may have been appropriate in the past when ski areas were smaller and relatively few in number, this system was not designed to handle the growth that this industry has witnessed. During the last two decades we have seen a meteoric growth in snow skiing in this country, making skiing clearly one of the fastest growing and most popular recreational uses of the national forests. In fact, while ski resorts occupy an aggregate total of less than 100,000 acres nationwide—a minute fraction of 1 percent of the total national forest lands—they account for over 6 percent of the recreational visitor-use on the forests.

As a general rule, the Forest Service has reliably renewed the annual permits as long as the present 30-year permit was in effect. Yet as resort facility growth requirements are needed to meet an ever increasing skier population, the present permit system poses a potential problem for the financing of ski areas and the accompanying capital-intensive facilities.

Pending tax-reform legislation creates additional uncertainty with regard to financing development of new resorts, and additional improvements to existing alpine areas. Recent trends in financing practices, the possible elimination of industrial revenue bonds, and the perception that an annual permit lacks the long-term se-

curity required for collateral for a private lender, will result in increased costs and diminished access to new capital for investment in new ski developments or for major improvements to existing areas. Therefore, new Forest Service permits should provide for an extended lease period so that they may be used as long-term collateral for financing improvements beyond the 5-10 years necessary to develop an area to the point where the project can attract additional private investment.

In conclusion, H.R. 4489 will play an important role in giving ski resort operators the flexibility to meet future capital requirements for upgrading the quality and safety of ski areas. I commend the sponsors, and strongly support the National Forest Ski Area Permit Act of 1986. I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NATCHER). The gentleman from California [Mr. SHUMWAY] has consumed 2 minutes.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the National Forest Ski Area Permit Act along with 20 of my colleagues in the House. I am pleased that my amendment, the 40 years consolidated lease, was accepted as the compromise package. This legislation will go a long way in creating a favorable atmosphere to consolidate, expedite, and minimize the administrative burdens ski area operators face on U.S. Forest Service lands.

In my home State of New Mexico, seven ski resorts operate on a portion of my State's 29 million acres of Forest Service land at Taos, Santa Fe, Sandia Peak, Sierra Blanca, Cloudcroft, Red River, and Sipapu. These areas have the capacity of accommodating 17,000 skiers per day. The ski industry is growing in New Mexico—providing jobs and economic development in New Mexico's Third Congressional District. H.R. 4489 can only help to complement and promote the development of ski areas by creating a stable atmosphere in the granting of long-term leases.

The longer term consolidated lease—up to 40 years—is the most important feature of this legislation. It is a concept which has enjoyed bipartisan support. The longer term lease arrangement will enable ski operators to borrow money at lower terms to make improvements. The longer term lease possibility may ultimately result in ski enthusiasts being able to buy lift tickets at lower prices and assist the Forest Service in their overall long-term planning efforts.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4489, would simply consolidate current law and allow the Secretary of the interior to

issue one permit to a ski resort that operates on over 80 acres of U.S. Forest Service land. That ski operator would have greater flexibility to make improvements including the construction of hotels and other buildings for recreation, public convenience, or safety.

Recently, a report completed by the Library of Congress stated that with current permitting practices, "(lenders) may compensate for the lack of collateral value in the Forest Service permit in several ways, including making less money available to a borrower, reducing the term of the loan, or charging a higher interest rate." This indicates that the current permitting practices may be limiting the availability of commercial loans necessary to expand or build a ski area.

Mr. Speaker, the ski industry is important to New Mexico—promoting jobs and clean industry—I urge my colleagues to think snow and to support H.R. 4489 and create an atmosphere that will stimulate growth in the ski industry.

□ 1420

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN], who is also one of the strong supporters of this bill in our committee.

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4489, the National Forest Ski Area Permit Act of 1986, legislation which will bring ski permitting on national forests into the 1980's. As my colleagues may know, the ski industry now must operate under an outmoded 1915 law which requires a dual permit system—one 30-year permit for use of 80 acres of land and yet another permit for the rest of a ski area, which must be obtained year after year after year.

The current system is inefficient from a land management point of view and it is inequitable from the ski industry point of view. Financing for the capital outlays associated with ski resorts is unnecessarily difficult under the present law, and I think we can all agree it is time for a change.

H.R. 4489 will improve the old system by consolidating two permits running different lengths of time into one permit for the entire ski area which may be issued for up to 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, skiers and the ski industry are a rapidly growing part of our American lifestyle and the American economy. My own district, which includes the Mammoth ski area, boasts some of the finest ski slopes in the world. I urge my colleagues to join in support of this bipartisan, balanced



legislation to update the process for ski permits on U.S. forest land.

I also thank the two gentlemen from Colorado and our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING], for an outstanding job of expediting this bill.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to the two gentlemen from Colorado [Mr. WIRTH and Mr. STRANG] for the fine work that they have done on this bill and the far-sightedness they had in introducing this legislation.

I think it is important to point out that the permit system that is now in existence for ski operators is outdated and outmoded and it is time for a change. The dual permit system is something simply that should be replaced.

Skiing is good for Western States. Skiing is good in many respects, but it has certainly been good economically for the State of Nevada. It is a tourist-oriented economy we have in Nevada. I think that skiing has come into its own. It is now a modern sport and I think that if skiing is a modern sport, we should have modern laws that govern the operators.

The law governing the regulation of ski areas and the dual-permit system is outmoded, outdated and we should move into the modern world.

Therefore, I commend and applaud the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING], for moving this as rapidly as he did and ask my colleagues to support this much-needed legislation.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NATCHER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4489, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4489, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
July 28, 1986.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5, Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House at 3:50 p.m. on Monday, July 28, 1986 and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits the 1985 annual reports of the Department of Labor, of the Department of Health and Human Services, and of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970.

With kind regards, I am,

BENJAMIN J. GUTHRIE,  
*Clerk, House of Representatives.*

#### ANNUAL REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NATCHER) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of yesterday, Monday, July 28, 1986, at page 17841.)

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 5203, and that I may be permitted to include extraneous and tabular matter and charts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1987

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5203) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentle-

man from California [Mr. LEWIS] and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I probably will not object, but the thought did occur to me, however, that the time is equally divided between two ardent advocates of the bill. I know the gentlemen will see that some of us who take a less rosy view of the bill will be taken care of during the scheduled debate; I am secure in that confidence and have this overwhelming trust in the two gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1430

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5203, with Mr. GEPHARDT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege to present the legislative branch appropriation bill for fiscal year 1987, H.R. 5203.

At the outset, I want to thank the members of my subcommittee who share the responsibility with me to oversee legislative appropriations: Mr. OBEY, Wisconsin; Mr. ALEXANDER, Arkansas; Mr. MURTHA, Pennsylvania; Mr. TRAXLER, Michigan; Mrs. BOGGS, Louisiana; Mr. WHITTEN, full committee chairman; Mr. LEWIS, California, ranking subcommittee; Mr. CONTE, Massachusetts, ranking full committee; Mr. MYERS, Indiana; Mr. PORTER, Illinois.

In addition, I want to acknowledge the Committee on House Administration who we work with very closely. That committee authorizes many of the items which we fund in the bill. I especially want to thank:

Chairman FRANK ANNUNZIO, BILL FRENZEL, ranking minority, and CHARLIE ROSE and BILL THOMAS, the chairman and ranking minority of the Office Systems Subcommittee. Our subcommittee has worked closely with them on the issue of telecommunications throughout the legislative branch.

The legislative branch appropriation bill for fiscal year 1987 totals \$1,305,264,000. Of that amount, \$774,838,100 is for congressional operations, excluding Senate items which we defer for consideration in the other body, and \$530,426,000 for other agencies.

We have reduced the budget request by \$178,954,900. A 12-percent reduction.

In comparison to the budget resolution, our report indicates on page 34 that we are \$379 million under our section 302(b) target for budget authority. In the mandatory items, the bill is \$49 million under the ceiling, and \$330 million under our discretionary ceiling.

We are \$351 million under the 302(b) outlay ceilings, of which \$48 million are discretionary outlays and \$303 million under in the mandatory accounts.

These figures do not include the permanent appropriations or the Senate items, all of which are assigned in our targets. While we do not have the final figures for those items, we can estimate them by using the CBO "baseline" estimates, which were the basis of most of the mandatory program targets used by CBO and incorporated in the Budget Committee allocations. I want to stress that these figures are not the official ones, but they are reasonable to use in making estimates.

Using those assumptions, the bill is \$30.7 million under the 302(b) budget authority ceiling and \$12.6 million under the outlay target.

Mr. Chairman, I will not quibble with these estimates, but I believe we are at least \$24 million more under the outlay target, a sum of money that I believe will not be outlaid in fiscal 1987, even though they appear in the CBO and Budget Committee data bases.

In other words, my assessment would be that the bill is \$36.6 million under the outlay target.

In comparison to fiscal year 1986, the bill is \$46,286,100 above the post-Gramm-Rudman level. That is a 3.7-percent increase, which is even less than the 4.3-percent sequestration order.

If we look at the pre-Gramm-Rudman level—the bill actually enacted last year with the supplements—we are \$9.1 million less than fiscal year 1986. That is a 0.7-percent (seven-tenths of 1 percent) reduction.

Compared to fiscal 1985—2 years ago—the bill is less than 1 percent

above that year. That is an average of less than 0.5-percent (five-tenths of 1 percent) increase per year.

The \$46 million in increases are just a reflection of the additional costs of doing business. For example, we had to add \$23 million just to pay for the merit and longevity increases for the 30,000 employees of the legislative branch funded in this bill and to fund authorized positions; we had to add \$6 million for the new retirement program just for House employees; there is a \$1.9 million increase for a raise for the Capitol police; we had to add \$3.5 million because of increases to our FTS telephone rates, and to fund a furniture acquisition program because GSA now requires purchase instead of long-term leases; there is an additional \$14.5 million for contracts, equipment, and publication price increases; and there is \$12 million due to new furniture and equipment such as that provided for the colonades in the restored Thomas Jefferson Building at the Library of Congress. These increases go far beyond the \$46 million above the 1986 level. We have offset some of these costs by reducing capability, reductions in staffing, and other reductions.

For example, there will be a reduction of about 2 percent in jobs of the agencies covered by the bill. We have added 30 essential new jobs. But 62 jobs have been abolished, and the bill blocks the funding of another 428 jobs. Overall, that is a reduction of 460 jobs (2 percent).

Title I of the bill is for congressional operations. It consists of \$463,832,100 for the House of Representatives; \$106,324,000 for joint items; \$15,532,000 for the Office of Technology Assessment; \$17,251,000 for the Congressional Budget Office; \$70,297,000 for the Architect of the Capitol; \$39,602,000 for the Congressional Research Service; and \$62 million for congressional printing and binding.

In title II, there is \$2,062,000 for the Botanic Garden; \$182,970,000 for the Library of Congress; \$6 million for Library buildings and grounds; \$123,000 for the Copyright Royalty Tribunal; \$33,681,000 for additional Government Printing Office programs; \$304,910,000 for the General Accounting Office; and \$600,000 for the Railroad Accounting Principles Board.

In title III, there are various provisions, including one that requires the Architect of the Capitol to develop a telecommunications plan that will encompass the entire legislative branch. This is an outgrowth of hearings we held on this subject, and should enable us to take advantage of the benefits of technology and cost breakthroughs in telephone equipment, and data and voice grade switches. I believe we can achieve significant savings on equipment and maintenance and do

a better job of coordinating these developments throughout the legislative branch. I want to acknowledge especially the help we have had on this subject from Congressman CHARLIE ROSE, Chairman ANNUNZIO, and Congressman BILL THOMAS.

Mr. Chairman, in summary, this is a tight bill, but a responsible one. We have tried to protect the core legislative functions that are essential to an effective Congress. We have maintained the Gramm-Rudman reductions and we have trimmed the maximum amount possible.

There is no need to apologize for this bill or for the vote of any Member in support of the bill.

I urge an "aye" vote on H.R. 5203.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee and the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] also, and the members of the Committee on House Administration. Through their diligent efforts, we are going to be able to have a uniform, we hope, telecommunications system; we will be able to call the Senate without placing a long distance call, or to the Library of Congress.

I think it is awfully important that the membership know the role that each of you have played in making this a possibility. It is not a reality yet, but we are working in that direction. It makes an eminent amount of sense, but when you have the kind of turf struggles that go on around this place, including the Library of Congress and elsewhere, sometimes it is difficult to do the right thing.

The gentleman is doing the right thing; the Members are appreciative of that fact, and so are the taxpayers.

□ 1440

Mr. FAZIO. I thank my friend from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LEATH of Texas). The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment to share with the House my own appreciation for my chairman, VIC FAZIO, from California. All of us know that the legislative branch bill is a very difficult bill. It is not the most delightful of activities around here to work on that measure that involves developing our own expenditures, the



required appropriations for the Congress to carry out its work.

Vic Fazio happens to have a newspaper in his region that just loves to beat legislators over the head, and it specifically likes to keep legislative bodies like the proverbial barefoot and pregnant.

In that connection they spend plenty of time beating him over the head for his leadership in this very necessary and very important area.

It is unpopular to vote for funding for your own office, committee, and staff expenses.

The appropriations bill laid before us provides funding for the work of the Congress and those agencies which are critical in terms of backup and develop the expertise we need to carry out the work for which we are all elected; such a bill should demonstrate that the Congress is willing by example to exercise the sort of budget restraint we are calling for across the board in American Government.

You, the Members, have indicated that reducing the national deficit is of highest priority. Further, you have indicated that critical to meeting that challenge is the need to reverse past patterns of growth in appropriations. The legislative branch bill is solid evidence that we are taking you seriously. Mr. FAZIO and his staff have worked hard, and this is a tight responsible bill. This bill meets our Gramm-Rudman targets as set forth for us by the budget resolution. I am pleased to report that we are neither over the budget authority, in fact we are some \$49 million under, nor are we over in the currently dreaded outlay figures. This is a tough bill. We hear testimony from our colleagues requesting assistance, we hear testimony from people who want money for various special projects and interests.

We look at the money available, and we have got to tell our friends there just "ain't" no more money. We denied budget requests to every single agency for which we are responsible, including over \$22 million for the House of Representatives. Our bill is \$180 million less than was requested. That reflects a full 12-percent reduction from the spending requests we received from congressional committees, Members, and our support agencies.

Every agency took Gramm-Rudman reductions. No one escaped the sequester knife.

Because spending for the legislative branch usually is larger in even-numbered years, a comparison with the 1985 appropriations is instructive. This proposal for fiscal year 1987 is just \$46 million above that which was appropriated and spent in 1985; even though it includes sizable requirements such as our computers, telephone, and office equipment costs, nonetheless the bill is a fractional increase over a

2-year period, approximately 0.5-percent adjustment per year.

Chairman FAZIO has briefly outlined the provisions of the bill title by title. I need not redundantly cover that ground. But there are two very significant areas of concern that I want to provide for the attention of my colleagues regarding this bill.

First, it should be pointed out that history and tradition in our subcommittee place committee budgets in the category of mandatory appropriations. That means that committee chairmen and ranking members go out to the House Administration Committee, make their case for spending authority, and our subcommittee then automatically appropriates. The Appropriations Subcommittee responds in this fashion to almost no other area of Government. We do not do so in defense, we do not do it for programs that affect hungry children, but nonetheless in this case because of the history of the matter this essentially is automatic appropriation. Clearly, you cannot say that committee staff expansion has been somehow considerably lower than inflation. Nonetheless, in terms of the appropriations process we essentially give those committee expansions a cursory review, and we appropriate. I think this is wrong. It is something we should change in the future. I think we do a better job of controlling that pattern of growth if the Appropriations Committee helped our colleagues on the Committee on House Administration.

In another area, my concern centers around the continued escalation in the volume of congressionally initiated mail and the cost of that mail. Modernization of Congress has not automatically led to a less expensive Congress. The computer is upon us, and we are using it to a fare-thee-well. The flood of unsolicited mail that flows from these Halls, at every quiver in the legislative process, costs money. This bill reflects that reality. The Post Office Department estimates that we will need approximately \$96 million to pay our postage bill this year.

The Franking Commission, I might add, under the leadership of BILL FRENZEL, will soon be sending to each Member a series of suggested changes in the Congressional Mail Program with requests for your reaction, individual Members' reactions and suggestions. Only through your serious attention to the ways and means available to us for reducing this explosive pattern of mail growth will we actually be able to control the efforts to reduce spending by the legislative branch reflected in this bill.

As a member of the Franking Commission, I will await your response, and I urge your support for many of those changes while at this hearing I urge your support for this legislative branch appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LEATH of Texas). The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has consumed 7 minutes.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO].

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I thank Chairman FAZIO.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this year's legislative branch appropriations bill. The amount requested is below last year's request before applying Gramm-Rudman. This bill holds the line on spending. It recognizes and funds only the absolutely essential needs of the Congress. The request sets an example for the executive branch on fiscal restraint. Overall the growth rate is lower than ever before. My congratulations to the fine stewardship of Chairman FAZIO, his ranking minority member, Mr. JERRY LEWIS, and the other members of the Appropriations Subcommittee for an excellent job and a responsible effort. We owe much credit to Chairman WHITTEN and ranking minority member Mr. CONTE for setting the stage for this appropriation, and all the other appropriations. They have been frugal, yet judicious, fair, and sensitive managers of the Nation's tax dollars.

In several categories there are overall reductions. Every effort will be made during this period of reduced resources to ensure that Members can continue to communicate with their constituents. That is the very heart of our jobs. My committee will try to make scarce resources go further. But do not expect any additional allowance authorization, though we will make every effort to free up as many dollars as we can.

And let me repeat a statement I made on the floor at the beginning of this session: If you vote to create any special or select committees in the next Congress, you had better be prepared to vote money for them. It would unfairly raise the expectations of various constituent groups to vote for the creation of a committee and then refuse to support the funds necessary to operate it.

I have repeated this statement time and time again. I have come to the floor of this House, and have asked Members of the Congress who want to create these committees to stop demagoging. If you vote for these committees, then have the guts to vote for the funds.

As far as the Committee on House Administration and my ranking committee member, Mr. FRENZEL, are concerned, we have cautioned repeatedly

about creating these committees, and we are going to continue to do so.

I also want to mention that the House has bought a phone system. It will be much more cost effective than our present arrangement, and will save the House a substantial amount of money. Since the necessary funds for installation are not included in this bill, I will seek funding as the necessary amounts determined.

Again I want to thank Chairman FAZIO for giving me this time. I congratulate his subcommittee and the full committee for successfully completing the thankless task of sorting through all the competing financial demands of the institution and recommending reasonable sums only for those functions which are meritorious.

I want to say that in complying with the Gramm-Rudman sequestrations earlier this year, all of the committee chairmen have been most cooperative. Only where necessary have they come to the committee seeking additional funds. However, despite the fact that the cases that they brought before us were deserving, we have processed no supplemental funding resolutions. We have reduced Members' expenses, we have had to cut positions, we have done everything possible to comply with the act. But if there is an effort made this afternoon, and I am not sure whether such an effort will be made, to have an across-the-board cut, remember you are cutting the very guts of our legislative system. If this Congress cannot serve its constituents, or cannot carry on the work of its committees, then this Congress has no right to function.

So I urge all of you to vote down any attempt at an indiscriminant, across-the-board cut, because as chairman of the full Committee on House Administration, the membership of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Subcommittee and its chairman know, I have tried to hold the line. I have tried to meet the requests of the individual Members with the available resources, and I have tried to meet the requests of the chairmen and their ranking minority members.

So I ask you to vote "aye" with the subcommittee on the legislative appropriations bill, and support an orderly process of implementing the Gramm-Rudman cuts.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] has consumed 6 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL].

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise, as have the three previous speakers, to salute the subcommittee for its splendid work, and to pick up on a theme that two other speakers have raised here already, and that is the prospective change in our telephone system

which has been a matter, I think, of excellent cooperation and communication between a number of our committees, including the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee and the Committee on House Administration.

□ 1455

Because of deregulation and because of an obsolescent system, we have been obliged to plan for a new system. In addition to providing better service and coordinated service, we estimate that we are going to save an awful lot of money over the next 10 years with this new system, perhaps as much as \$25 million.

It has already been noted here that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] have been largely responsible for this and I, for one, believe that is true. But they have been supported by the gentleman from Illinois, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and others. That is the kind of work that people on the outside, and even those of us on the inside, are really never aware of. Two members of our group spent time at nearly 100 meetings over the past year, in addition to their regular work, to work this matter out.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENZEL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman mentioning the names, but I want to be sure the record reflects the outstanding cooperation we received from the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] on all aspects of the work in the House Administration Committee, especially on this telephone system.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his generous comments.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go forward and suggest that what the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has said about this bill is true. The Legislative Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations is no longer a fun place. You cannot give out goodies to every Member who walks down the street. You have to be a little tight. Gramm-Rudman and the looming deficit has made that committee a lot less attractive. It is having to stand up and say, no, we cannot give you this, or we cannot give you that.

I want to commend the committee for its work. But I also want to tell the Members of this body that I intend to offer an amendment to help it with its work so that we can do it a little bit better than this bill. I appreciate that it is easier for me because I do not have to listen to the people who come

and present the cases that committee members do.

I do not mean to second guess their judgment. I simply mean that, as a single Representative, I feel obliged to offer an amendment that does a bit more cutting than they do.

I want to invite the attention of the Members to a couple of facts. The first one is that this bill appropriates about \$46 million more than the bill did last year, including supplementals, and that is a postsequester comparison. That means that this year's expenditures projected, if we assume no supplementals, are about 3.51 percent more in budget authority than last year.

I think this is one of the few subcommittees where we do not worry a great deal about outlays. They are roughly the same as budget authorities, except for small amounts that are squirreled away in some funds that do not cancel for a while.

But my problem with the bill is that we have given ourselves too-juicy an increase and I am going to ask the House to reduce some of that.

Let me now identify what some of these items are in the \$46 million of increases.

The House leadership, all of them, the majority, minority wrapped up as a whole, have an increase of about 6 percent over last year. That is more than inflation. That is more than their duties would seem to require.

Committee employees, I regret to have to say, are costing 16 percent more than last year. That is an item I would identify as the statutory committee employees, or rule XI employees.

Standing committees, which in this bill are the investigative committee staff, are given a 7-percent increase, again more than twice of inflation.

The Committee on Appropriations, which is bringing us this bill, has a 10-percent increase in the moneys expended for its staff. I am sure it is looking for a tougher year next year, but I wonder how we can justify that.

The Doorkeeper gets 10 percent more. The Democratic Steering Committee and the Republican Conference, receive an 18-percent increase.

The Joint Committee on Printing, I doubt there are two dozen Members in this hall who could identify that committee or what it does or if indeed it ever meets, it gets a 5-percent increase, which is slightly larger than the cost of inflation.

The Office of Technology Assessment receives twice the increase of inflation. I am sure we have all read some of its reports.

The Congressional Budget Office, the world's greatest estimating group, will be given a 7-percent increase.

The GAO, that crowd that can count the beans in the jar if there are no



more than three, is getting a 6-percent increase, which is again twice the cost of inflation.

If you look on page 49, you will see that all House operations expenses are up by 7 percent or \$34 million. Perhaps that increase is necessary, but I would like to give the Members a chance to vote on it.

I do not think we can convince the public that we have a handle on our fiscal problem unless we restrain our expenditures to last year's expenditures, or at least to something less than twice the rate of inflation.

We have made some cuts. We cut the Botanic Garden. We cut the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Bio-medical Ethics Board and even the Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to go through all the accounts in the legislative appropriation budget. It is clear the committee has done a good job. It is trying to restrain itself. We have seen what I would call abnormal growth in its account over the years, and the committee has made a good step forward this year.

I will offer an amendment to eliminate that \$46 million increase, which is mostly going to our employees for our own operation. I would think that if every Member worked a little bit harder and each Member's staff worked a little bit harder, we should be able to get along next year on the amount of money that was given to us.

Incidentally, my amendment will not include the Office of the Chaplain, nor the amount for the widow of one of our deceased Members, but it will include all of the others across the board. It is the usual amendment which ratifies the decision of the committee with respect to the comparative standing levels in the budget, but seeks to make an amendment to take us down to last year's budget authority level.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I, like the gentleman from Minnesota, have some concerns about the bill. For example, on page 3 of the bill I note that the furniture and furnishings account for the House of Representatives has gone up by \$518,000 over last year, which is a 54-percent increase over last year's spending. One has to wonder why we need to increase furniture by 54 percent in a year in which we are attempting to maintain some semblance of order in our budgetary matters.

A more major concern for me is when I get back to page 10 of the bill and look at the amount of money for the official mail costs. The amount of money in the bill is certainly in line with the figure that we spent this

year. However, there is some interesting language put into the bill, and that is that the money is going to be made available immediately upon enactment of this act, which literally means that this bill becomes a supplemental appropriation for this year's overspending in the frank mail account. That gives this gentleman some pause, because we have had quite a controversy about whether or not the House should live within its own means on franked mail. The fact is it appears as though we are not going to be able to do that based upon the last year's appropriation, and now we are coming in and suggesting that, well, we will take care of that problem by simply putting money in the next year but saying it can be spent this year, probably then short changing us for next year, which means that we will then run into the same problem again.

Far better that the House would become a little bit more responsible in its mailing patterns than to resort to this kind of legislative gimmickry.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make clear that that language the gentleman refers to with regard to postage has been in the bill certainly as long as I have been on the committee. It is not something that has been inserted this year to deal with a particular problem.

In fact, I think it is important to point out that the Members are acting with increasing, and I might even say surprising, responsibility to reduce their mailings and the amount of money that is being spent on postage. In fact, if they keep mailing at the reduced rates that they are currently, we may well find that the amount that was cut from the \$104 million that we originally provided in last year's bill, the \$95.7 million that is available in the current fiscal year, might suffice. We are moving in that direction. When we know what the year-end total will be, we will make an effort to deal with that.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, let me reclaim my time, unless the gentleman is going to yield me a little bit of time.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to respond to the gentleman's first question about furniture if the gentleman is interested.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I have a limited amount of time, but I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

□ 1505

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I would just simply say that this is the first year the GSA has mandated that we

purchase our district office furniture. So instead of having it available to us at a lower multiyear rental or lease cost, we have to purchase it up front. That is why that percentage is as high as the gentleman indicated.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. That is a useful explanation. But let me say to the gentleman that the fact of the matter is that we do have a situation on franked mail cost where we are appropriating in a way which will allow this year's mail cost to be covered under next year's appropriation. That gives this gentleman some concern.

I am happy to hear from the gentleman that the Members are becoming more responsible in their mailing habits. That may be good news for the future, and hopefully that can hold up.

I had checked with the staff previously on section 303 of the bill. I am told that that section is also language that has been carried in previous years and represents no change in the act. I simply was concerned because it showed up in a place in the bill or in the report that indicated a legislative change.

Mr. Chairman, I have one final question, if I may, of the subcommittee chairman. On page 29 of the bill, in section 307, there is language that appears to be an effort to take line items out of the Budget Act with regard to Congress. In other words, it appears to this gentleman as though what we are trying to do is increase the latitude to adjust moneys within accounts under the Budget Act. Is that in fact the intent of this particular section of the bill?

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I might just indicate that I appreciate having the chance to clarify that. We simply found that under Gramm-Rudman we were operating with very, very strict requirements and we did need some additional flexibility in order to provide what I think is a very logical reorganization of funds. Should some sequestration occur in the future, I think we will be better prepared. This will not violate the tenets of the Gramm-Rudman law but enable us to avoid making, with regard to all the House accounts, what I think are very foolish and impossible choices between very, very small and very tightly defined accounts.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, let me see if I understand this. Is the gentleman then indicating to us that should we go to sequestration and, say, sequestration demands a 3.7-percent cut, under this procedure the whole House of Representatives would be cut by the 3.7 percent, but individual accounts within the House of Representatives would not necessarily be cut by that amount; is that true?

Mr. FAZIO. We would have additional flexibility in that context, yes. The overall sequestration cut would certainly be made, but we would have additional flexibility in administering the cut.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if I could understand it, then, we might take 15 percent out of some accounts and leave other accounts untouched; is that true?

Mr. FAZIO. I would not speculate as to how we would perform, but we had a very difficult time with very exacting requirements under the existing law, and this is simply an effort to provide some additional flexibility to the fiscal managers of the House.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I would say to the gentleman that I think it is probably a useful management tool. I guess what this gentleman questions is, if it is a useful management tool for the Congress, why would it not be a useful management tool for some of the agencies of government? A number of them, for instance the Defense Department, would probably like to have the cuts specified in such a way that they did not go to individual line items as well.

It seems to me that once again we are exempting ourselves from some of the pain that we so gloriously like to inflict on others.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I understand the point he is trying to make, but we certainly would not want to be in the position of cutting a gratuity to a widow or cutting the pay of the chaplain or cutting back on some of the other very small accounts. This would really unnecessarily tie the hands of the House in the normal course of our business. For example, we were not able to handle the requirements of the Claiborne case in the Judiciary Committee because we did not have any flexibility.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time, I appreciate the point the gentleman is making. I simply say that we have a habit around here of seeing things from our own perspective and changing things as they affect us but not recognizing that that also should be true in other cases in actions that we take.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I simply would point out—and I think the gentleman from California [Mr. Lewis] would verify this—that I think the gentleman is inexact in one sense. The fact is that we have just provided in the foreign operations bill latitude for the administration to make the cuts that are going to be required in a number of accounts in order to reach the lower Gramm-Rudman outlay ceilings, and we have allowed the adminis-

tration to pick and choose in terms of how they intend to move the money around within a limited number of accounts in order to accomplish that purpose.

So we are trying to provide the same degree of latitude on occasion for the executive branch.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that explanation.

I would say it is my impression that we certainly have not done that across the board, and it simply struck this gentleman in reading through the bill that we were providing ourselves some latitude to try to escape some of the pain of that which we intend to inflict upon others.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, again I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I think the Members will remember that in the 1986 sequestration we provided some flexibility to the Defense Department, particularly in the area of personnel. We granted some flexibility to the Administrative Office of the Courts for the Judiciary Branch.

I think this is one way of keeping people from making unfair attacks on Gramm-Rudman and in that manner causing the bill to have a shorter stay with us.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman may be right, that it is useful, but I think the Members should know in considering the bill that we are in fact taking out of the perusal of the Budget Act the line-item authority that originally was there.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, by way of commenting on the question raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], let me say that he points to a fact in our bill. There is language that provides for some additional flexibility in terms of transferring funds when we run into special kinds of limitations or squeeze points in a legislative year.

For the record, I might mention, however, that in our total bill, all of the expenditures for the legislative branch and our support agencies reflect a very, very small—almost minuscule—part of a bill or a budget such as the Defense Department has. It is kind of like going to the Defense Department and limiting, by way of our own budgetary process, how much they will spend on brown shoes and how much they will spend on black shoes.

As a fact of life, we do need some flexibility in these very difficult times, and I personally believe it is appropriate in this bill.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is dead right. We have to have the ability to cut in some areas and let some go. I think the committee has handled that responsibly. Without flexibility, we cannot make rational cuts.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, if I might just read from the Gramm-Rudman law itself, I think it would be helpful in order to terminate this argument.

This is what it says:

The Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate may, after consultation with each other, define the term "program, project, and activity," and report to their respective Houses, with respect to matters within their jurisdiction, and the order issued by the President shall sequester funds in accordance with such definition.

We are acting in total accordance with Gramm-Rudman.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 5203, the legislative branch appropriations for fiscal year 1987 and in opposition to the cutting amendments?

Mr. Chairman, this bill is under the fiscal year 1987 budget recommendations by \$178,954,900 or 12 percent. It is under the 302(b) budget allocation in accordance with the conference report on the budget resolution by \$49,067,000. Furthermore, 62 positions in the House of Representatives have been eliminated and 428 positions have not been funded and will be eliminated through attrition. This bill represents austerity, as it should, for the entire Federal Government.

While Members may demagogue on the issue of House funding, some basic facts must be pointed out. The bill before us today would appropriate \$1,305,264,100 in fiscal year 1987. This funding includes \$774.8 million for congressional operations and \$530.4 million for the activities of related agencies, such as the Library of Congress, the General Accounting Office, and the Government Printing Office.

Since 1978, the average annual appropriations for the legislative branch has risen by 5.8 percent. At the same time, the price level measured by the Consumer Price Index has risen by 6.3 percent while expenditures for congressional operations have risen by only 5.7 percent. As a result, there has been a slippage of 5.3 percent over that period between expenditures and current services for congressional operations.

The bill, when compared to the regular appropriations for fiscal year 1986, is \$9.133 million less. Last year, the Congress froze the fiscal year 1986 bill at the fiscal year 1985



level. Therefore, this bill is below the fiscal year 1985 level.

Mr. Chairman, this bill meets the needs of the Congress and the related agencies. It is not a glamorous bill, but it is the peoples' bill because the Congress and its agencies—the Library of Congress, the General Accounting Agency, and the Government Printing Office, are the peoples' representatives. It is not a flamboyant bill—its costs are frozen below the fiscal year 1985 level. There is a lot of room for demagoguery, but there is no place for it. The committee has done its job well. The cutting amendments are nothing more than political posturing seeking to distort the facts for political gain. Gain at the expense of the people and their body, the Congress.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have no additional requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5203

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes, namely:

#### TITLE I—CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

##### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

##### PAYMENTS TO WIDOWS AND HEIRS OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

For payment to Grace Addabbo, widow of Joseph P. Addabbo, late a Representative from the State of New York, \$75,100.

##### MILEAGE OF MEMBERS

For mileage of Members, as authorized by law, \$210,000.

##### HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES

For salaries and expenses, as authorized by law, \$3,357,000, including: Office of the Speaker, \$775,000, including \$18,000 for official expenses of the Speaker; Office of the Majority Floor Leader, \$688,000, including \$10,000 for official expenses of the Majority Leader; Office of the Minority Floor Leader, \$767,000, including \$10,000 for official expenses of the Minority Leader; Office of the Majority Whip, \$603,000, including \$1,000 for official expenses of the Majority Whip and not to exceed \$145,540 for the Chief Deputy Majority Whip; Office of the Minority Whip, \$524,000, including \$1,000 for official expenses of the Minority Whip and not to exceed \$76,840 for the Chief Deputy Minority Whip.

##### MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE

For staff employed by each Member in the discharge of his official and representative duties, \$170,186,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against this portion of the bill?

Are there any amendments?

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the bill, is as follows:

##### COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

For professional and clerical employees of standing committees, including the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget, \$48,000,000.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET (STUDIES)

For salaries, expenses, and studies by the Committee on the Budget, and temporary personal services for such committee to be expended in accordance with sections 101(c), 606, 703, and 901(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and to be available for reimbursement to agencies for services performed, \$329,000.

##### CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

##### STANDING COMMITTEES, SPECIAL AND SELECT

For salaries and expenses of standing committees, special and select, authorized by the House, \$48,311,000.

##### ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

For allowances and expenses as authorized by House resolution or law, \$137,928,000, including: Official Expenses of Members, \$79,300,000; supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims, \$14,536,000; furniture and furnishings, \$1,475,000; stenographic reporting of committee hearings, \$550,000; reemployed annuitants reimbursements, \$750,000; Government contributions to employees' life insurance fund, retirement fund, Social Security fund, Medicare fund, health benefits fund, and worker's and unemployment compensation, \$40,695,000; and miscellaneous items including, but not limited to, purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair and operation of House motor vehicles, interparliamentary receptions and gratuities to heirs of deceased employees of the House, \$622,000.

Such amounts as are deemed necessary for the payment of allowances and expenses under this head may be transferred between the various categories within this appropriation, "Allowances and expenses", upon the approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

##### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS)

For salaries and expenses, studies and examinations of executive agencies, by the Committee on Appropriations, and temporary personal services for such committee, to be expended in accordance with section 202(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, 1946, and to be available for reimbursement to agencies for services performed, \$4,300,000.

##### SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation and expenses of officers and employees, as authorized by law, \$51,136,000, including: Office of the Clerk, \$13,825,000; Office of the Sergeant at Arms, including overtime, as authorized by law, \$20,595,000, of which \$1,896,000 shall be available only for adjustments in pay levels for the Capitol Police, as approved by the Committee on House Administration; Office of the Doorkeeper, including overtime, as authorized by law, \$6,992,000; Office of the Postmaster, \$2,278,000, including \$46,722 for employment of substitute messengers and extra services of regular employees when required at the salary rate of not to exceed \$16,278 per annum each; Office of the Chaplain, \$73,000; Office of the Parliamentarian, including the Parliamentarian and \$2,000 for preparing the Digest of Rules, \$634,000; for salaries and expenses of the

Office for the Bicentennial of the House of Representatives, \$226,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House, \$844,000; for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House, \$2,700,000; six minority employees, \$434,000; the House Democratic Steering Committee and Caucus, \$700,000; the House Republican Conference, \$700,000; and Other Authorized Employees, \$1,135,000.

Such amounts as are deemed necessary for the payment of salaries of officers and employees under this head may be transferred between the various offices and activities within this appropriation, "Salaries, officers and employees", upon the approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

##### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. Of the amounts appropriated in fiscal year 1987 for the House of Representatives under the headings "Committee employees", "Standing committees, special and select", "Salaries, officers and employees", "Allowances and expenses", and "Members' clerk hire", such amounts as are deemed necessary for the payment of salaries and expenses may be transferred among the aforementioned accounts upon approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 102. The provisions of H. Res. 320, approved November 14, 1985, establishing one additional position on the Capitol Police Force shall be permanent law with respect thereto.

SEC. 103. The provisions of H. Res. 21, approved December 11, 1985, establishing a Congressional child care center shall be permanent law with respect thereto.

SEC. 104. (a) The Clerk of the House of Representatives may dispose of used equipment of the House of Representatives, by trade-in or sale, directly or through the General Services Administration. Any direct disposal under the preceding sentence shall be in accordance with normal business practice and shall be at fair market value. Receipts from disposals under the first sentence of this subsection (together with receipts from sale of transcripts, waste paper and other items provided by law, and receipts for missing or damaged equipment) shall be deposited in the Treasury for credit to the appropriate account under the appropriation for "ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE", and shall be available for expenditure in accordance with applicable law. As used in this subsection, the term "used equipment" means such used or surplus equipment (including furniture and motor vehicles) as the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives may prescribe by regulation.

(b) The proviso in the matter under the center heading "HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES" and the center subheading "OFFICIAL REPORTERS TO COMMITTEES" in the first section of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes", approved July 17, 1947 (2 U.S.C. 84b), is amended by striking out "as 'Miscellaneous receipts'".

(c) This section and the amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1986.

##### JOINT ITEMS

For joint committees, as follows:

## CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

## JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Economic Committee, \$2,736,000.

## JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Printing, \$919,000.

## CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

## JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Taxation, \$4,159,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

For other joint items, as follows:

## OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

For medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses of the emergency rooms, and for the Attending Physician and his assistants, including (1) an allowance of \$1,000 per month to the Attending Physician; (2) an allowance of \$600 per month to one Senior Medical Officer while on duty in the Attending Physician's Office; (3) an allowance of \$200 per month each to two medical officers while on duty in the Attending Physician's office; (4) an allowance of \$200 per month each to not to exceed eleven assistants on the basis heretofore provided for such assistance; and (5) \$768,700 for reimbursement to the Department of the Navy for expenses incurred for staff and equipment assigned to the Office of the Attending Physician, such amount shall be advanced and credited to the applicable appropriation or appropriations from which such salaries, allowances, and other expenses are payable and shall be available for all the purposes thereof, \$1,098,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

## CAPITOL POLICE

## GENERAL EXPENSES

For purchasing and supplying uniforms; the purchase, maintenance, and repair of police motor vehicles, including two-way police radio equipment; contingent expenses, including advance payment for travel for training or other purposes, and expenses associated with the relocation of instructor personnel to and from the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center as approved by the Chairman of the Capitol Police Board, and including \$80 per month for extra services performed for the Capitol Police Board by such member of the staff of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate or the House as may be designated by the Chairman of the Board, \$1,701,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House: *Provided*, That the funds used to maintain the petty cash fund referred to as "Petty Cash II" which is to provide for the prevention and detection of crime shall not exceed \$4,000; *Provided further*, That the funds used to maintain the petty cash fund referred to as "Petty Cash III" which is to provide for the advance of travel expenses attendant to protective assignments shall not exceed \$4,000; *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the cost involved in providing basic training for members of the Capitol Police at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center for fiscal year 1987 shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury from funds available to the Treasury Department.

## OFFICIAL MAIL COSTS

For expenses necessary for official mail costs, \$94,818,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House, to be available immediately upon enactment of this Act.

## CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICE

For salaries and expenses of the Capitol Guide Service, \$880,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be used to employ more than twenty-eight individuals: *Provided further*, That the Capitol Guide Board is authorized, during emergencies, to employ not more than two additional individuals for not more than one hundred twenty days each, and not more than ten additional individuals for not more than six months each, for the Capitol Guide Service.

## STATEMENTS OF APPROPRIATIONS

For the preparation, under the direction of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives, of the statements for the second session of the Ninety-ninth Congress, showing appropriations made, indefinite appropriations, and contracts authorized, together with a chronological history of the regular appropriation bills as required by law, \$13,000, to be paid to the persons designated by the chairman of such committees to supervise the work.

OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY  
ASSESSMENT

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Technology Assessment Act of 1972 (Public Law 92-484), including reception and representation expenses (not to exceed \$3,000 from the Trust Fund), and rental of space in the District of Columbia, and those necessary to carry out the duties of the Director of the Office of Technology Assessment under Section 1886 of the Social Security Act as amended by Section 601 of the Social Security Amendments of 1983 (Public Law 98-21), and those necessary to carry out the duties of the Director of the Office of Technology Assessment under Part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act as amended by Section 9305 of the Consolidated Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-272), \$15,532,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds in the Act shall be available for salaries or expenses of any employee of the Office of Technology Assessment in excess of 143 staff employees: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for assessments or activities not initiated and approved in accordance with section 3(d) of Public Law 92-484, except that funds shall be available for the assessment required by Public Law 96-151: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries or expenses of employees of the Office of Technology Assessment in connection with any reimbursable study for which funds are provided from sources other than appropriations made under this Act, or be available for any other administrative expenses incurred by the Office of Technology Assessment in carrying out such a study.

## CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), \$17,251,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be available for the purchase or hire of a passenger motor vehicle: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries or expenses of any employee of the Congressional Budget Office in excess of 226 staff employees: *Provided further*, That any sale or lease of property, supplies, or services to the Congressional Budget Office shall be deemed to

be a sale or lease of such property, supplies, or services to the Congress subject to section 903 of Public Law 98-63.

## ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

## OFFICE OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

## SALARIES

For the Architect of the Capitol; the Assistant Architect of the Capitol; the Executive Assistant; and other personal services; at rates of pay provided by law, \$5,262,000.

## TRAVEL

Appropriations under the control of the Architect of the Capitol shall be available for expenses of travel on official business not to exceed in the aggregate under all funds the sum of \$20,000.

## CONTINGENT EXPENSES

To enable the Architect of the Capitol to make surveys and studies, and to meet unforeseen expenses in connection with activities under his care, \$100,000.

## CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

## CAPITOL BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol Building and electrical substations of the Senate and House Office Buildings, under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, including furnishings and office equipment; not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, to be expended as the Architect of the Capitol may approve; purchase or exchange, maintenance and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; to hereafter incur expenses authorized by the Act of December 13, 1973 (87 Stat. 704); for expenses of attendance, when specifically authorized by the Architect of the Capitol, at meetings or conventions in connection with subjects related to work under the Architect of the Capitol, \$11,959,000.

## CAPITOL GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for care and improvement of grounds surrounding the Capitol, the Senate and House Office Buildings, and the Capitol Power Plant, \$3,182,000.

## HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the House Office Buildings, including the position of Superintendent of Garages as authorized by law, \$25,227,000, of which \$4,991,000 shall remain available until expended.

## CAPITOL POWER PLANT

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol Power Plant; for lighting, heating, and power (including the purchase of electrical energy) for the Capitol, Senate and House Office Buildings, Congressional Library Buildings, and the grounds about the same, Botanic Garden, Senate garage, and for air conditioning refrigeration not supplied from plants in any of such buildings; for heating the Government Printing Office and Washington City Post Office and heating and chilled water for air conditioning for the Supreme Court Building, Union Station complex and the Folger Shakespeare Library, expenses for which shall be advanced or reimbursed upon request of the Architect of the Capitol and amounts so received shall be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation; \$24,567,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$1,950,000 of the funds credited or to be reimbursed to this appro-



provision as herein provided shall be available for obligation during fiscal year 1987.

#### LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

##### CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by section 321 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (2 U.S.C. 166) and to revise and extend the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America, \$39,602,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation may be used to pay any salary or expense in connection with any publication, or preparation of material therefor (except the Digest of Public General Bills), to be issued by the Library of Congress unless such publication has obtained prior approval of either the Committee on House Administration or the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the compensation of the Director of the Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, shall be at an annual rate which is equal to the annual rate of basic pay for positions at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

##### GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING

For authorized printing and binding for the Congress; for printing and binding for the Architect of the Capitol; expenses necessary for preparing the semimonthly and session index to the Congressional Record, as authorized by law (44 U.S.C. 902); and printing and binding of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed to Members of Congress, \$62,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for printing and binding part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture) nor for printing and binding the permanent edition of the Congressional Record authorized under 44 U.S.C. 906: *Provided further*, That, to the extent that funds remain from the unexpended balance of fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1985 funds obligated for the printing and binding costs of publications produced for the Bicentennial of the Congress, such remaining funds shall be available for the current year printing and binding cost of publications produced for the Bicentennial: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriations for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years.

This title may be cited as the "Congressional Operations Appropriation Act, 1987".

#### TITLE II—OTHER AGENCIES

##### BOTANIC GARDEN SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Botanic Garden and the nurseries, buildings, grounds, and collections; purchase and exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; all under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, \$2,062,000.

##### LIBRARY OF CONGRESS SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Library of Congress, not otherwise provided for, including development and maintenance of the Union Catalogs; custody, care and maintenance of the Library Buildings; special

clothing; cleaning, laundering and repair of uniforms; preservation of motion pictures in the custody of the Library; operation and maintenance of the American Folklife Center and the American Television and Radio Archives in the Library; preparation and distribution of catalog cards and other publications of the Library; and expenses of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board not properly chargeable to the income of any trust fund held by the Board, \$136,339,000, of which not more than \$4,700,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 1987 under the Act of June 28, 1902, as amended (2 U.S.C. 150): *Provided*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than the \$4,700,000: *Provided further*, That, of the total amount appropriated, \$4,266,000 is to remain available until expended for acquisition of books, periodicals, and newspapers, and all other materials including subscriptions for bibliographic services for the Library, including \$40,000 to be available solely for the purchase, when specifically approved by the Librarian, of special and unique materials for additions to the collections.

##### COPYRIGHT OFFICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Copyright Office, including publication of the decisions of the United States courts involving copyrights, \$17,302,000, of which not more than \$6,500,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 1987 under 17 U.S.C. 708(c), and not more than \$927,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 1987 under 17 U.S.C. 111(d)(3) and 116(c)(1): *Provided*, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than the \$7,427,000.

##### BOOKS FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses to carry out the provisions of the Act approved March 3, 1931, as amended (2 U.S.C. 135a), \$35,996,000.

##### COLLECTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF LIBRARY MATERIALS (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of section 104(b)(5) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), to remain available until expended, \$390,000, of which \$293,000 shall be available only for payments in any foreign currencies owed to or owned by the United States which the Treasury Department shall determine to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

##### FURNITURE AND FURNISHINGS

For necessary expenses for the purchase and repair of furniture, furnishings, office and library equipment, \$5,070,000, of which \$3,425,000 shall be available until expended only for the purchase and supply of furniture, shelving, furnishings, and related costs necessary for the renovation and restoration of the Thomas Jefferson and John Adams Library Buildings.

##### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Appropriations in this Act available to the Library of Congress shall be available, in an amount not to exceed \$101,390, of which \$23,900 is for the Con-

gressional Research Service, when specifically authorized by the Librarian, for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which the appropriation is made.

SEC. 202. (a) No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used by the Library of Congress to administer any flexible or compressed work schedule which—

(1) applies to any manager or supervisor in a position the grade or level of which is equal to or higher than GS-15; and

(2) grants the manager or supervisor the right to not be at work for all or a portion of a workday because of time worked by the manager or supervisor on another workday.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "manager or supervisor" means any management official or supervisor, as such terms are defined in section 7103(a) (10) and (11) of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 203. Appropriated funds received by the Library of Congress from other Federal agencies to cover general and administrative overhead costs generated by performing reimbursable work for other agencies under the authority of 31 U.S.C. 1535 and 1536 shall not be used to employ more than 65 employees.

##### ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

##### STRUCTURAL AND MECHANICAL CARE

For all necessary expenses for the mechanical and structural maintenance, care and operation of the Library buildings and grounds, \$6,080,000, of which \$265,000 shall remain available until expended.

##### COPYRIGHT ROYALTY TRIBUNAL SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Copyright Royalty Tribunal, \$617,000, of which \$494,000 shall be derived by collections from the appropriation "Payments to Copyright Owners" for the reasonable costs incurred in proceedings involving distribution of royalty fees as provided by 17 U.S.C. 807.

##### GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE PRINTING AND BINDING

For printing, binding, and distribution of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed without charge to the recipient, \$10,700,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for printing and binding part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture) nor for printing and binding the permanent edition of the Congressional Record authorized under 44 U.S.C. 906: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriations for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years.

##### OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS SALARIES AND EXPENSES (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Superintendent of Documents, including compensation of all employees in accordance with the provisions of 44 U.S.C. 305; travel expenses (not to exceed \$117,000); price lists and bibliographies; repairs to buildings, elevators, and machinery; and supplying publications to the Depository Library and International Exchange Programs; \$24,359,000, of which \$1,378,000 representing excess receipts from the sale of publications shall be derived from the Government Printing Office revolving fund: *Provided*, That \$300,000 of this appropriation

tion shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 1512), with the approval of the Public Printer, only to the extent necessary to provide for expenses (excluding permanent personal services) for workload increases not anticipated in the budget estimates and which cannot be provided for by normal budgetary adjustments.

#### GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE REVOLVING FUND

The Government Printing Office is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available and in accord with the law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs and purposes set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for the "Government Printing Office revolving fund": *Provided*, That not to exceed \$5,000 may be expended on the certification of the Public Printer in connection with official representation and reception expenses: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year the revolving fund shall be available for the hire of eight passenger motor vehicles: *Provided further*, That expenditures in connection with travel expenses of the advisory councils to the Public Printer shall be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of title 44, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for grade GS-18: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available to acquire needed land, located in Northwest D.C., which is adjacent to the present Government Printing Office, and is bounded by Massachusetts Avenue and the southern property line of the Government Printing Office, between North Capitol Street and First Street. The land to be purchased is identified as Parcels 45-D, 45-E, 45-F, and 47-A in Square 625, and includes the alleys adjacent to these parcels, and G Street, N.W. from North Capitol Street to First Street: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund and the funds provided under the paragraph entitled "Office of Superintendent of Documents, Salaries and Expenses" together may not be available for the full-time equivalent employment of more than 5,287 workyears: *Provided further*, That the revolving fund shall be available for expenses not to exceed \$25,000 to host a world-wide Public Printers' Conference.

#### GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office, including not to exceed \$5,000 to be expended on the certification of the Comptroller General of the United States in connection with official representation and reception expenses; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for grade GS-18; hire of one passenger motor vehicle; advance payments in foreign countries in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3324; benefits comparable to those payable under sections 901(5), 901(6) and 901(8) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4081(5), 4081(6) and 4081(8), respectively); and under regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, rental of living quarters in foreign countries and travel benefits compa-

table with those which are now or hereafter may be granted single employees of the Agency for International Development, including single Foreign Service personnel assigned to A.I.D. projects, by the Administrator of the Agency for International Development—or his designee—under the authority of section 636(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2396(b)); \$304,910,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the Joint Financial Management Improvement Program (JFMIP) shall be available to finance an appropriate share of JFMIP costs as determined by the JFMIP, including but not limited to the salary of the Executive Director and secretarial support: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the National Intergovernmental Audit Forum or a Regional Intergovernmental Audit Forum shall be available to finance an appropriate share of Forum costs as determined by the Forum, including necessary travel expenses of non-Federal participants. Payments hereunder to either the Forum or the JFMIP may be credited as reimbursements to any appropriation from which costs involved are initially financed: *Provided further*, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the American Consortium on International Public Administration (ACIPA) shall be available to finance an appropriate share of ACIPA costs as determined by the ACIPA, including any expenses attributable to membership of ACIPA in the International Institute of Administrative Sciences: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available to finance a portion, not to exceed \$50,000, of the costs of the Governmental Accounting Standards Board: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the expenses of planning the triennial Congress of the International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI) to be hosted by the U.S. General Accounting Office in Washington, D.C., in 1992.

#### RAILROAD ACCOUNTING PRINCIPLES BOARD

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Railroad Accounting Principles Board, \$600,000, to be expended in accordance with the provisions of H.R. 4439, 98th Congress, as passed by the House of Representatives on February 7, 1984.

#### TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for the maintenance or care of private vehicles, except for emergency assistance and cleaning as may be provided under regulations relating to parking facilities for the House of Representatives issued by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 303. Whenever any office or position not specifically established by the Legislative Pay Act of 1929 is appropriated for herein or whenever the rate of compensation or designation of any position appropriated for herein is different from that specifically established for such position by such Act, the rate of compensation and the desig-

nation of the position, or either, appropriated for or provided herein, shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: *Provided*, That the provisions herein for the various items of official expenses of Members, officers, and committees of the Senate and House, and clerk hire for Senators and Members shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

SEC. 304. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 305. (a) Upon enactment into law of this Act, the Architect of the Capitol, in consultation with the heads of the agencies of the legislative branch, shall develop an overall plan for satisfying the telecommunications requirements of such agencies, using a common system architecture for maximum interconnection capability and engineering compatibility. The plan shall be subject to joint approval by the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, and, upon approval, shall be communicated to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. No part of any appropriation in this Act or any other Act shall be used for acquisition of any new or expanded telecommunications system for an agency of the legislative branch, unless, as determined by the Architect of the Capitol, the acquisition is in conformance with the plan, as approved.

(b) As used in this section—

(1) the term "agency of the legislative branch" means, the office of the Architect of the Capitol, the Botanic Garden, the General Accounting Office, the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, the Office of Technology Assessment, and the Congressional Budget Office; and

(2) the term "telecommunications system" means an electronic system for voice, data, or image communication, including any associated cable and switching equipment.

SEC. 306. The last sentence of 44 U.S.C. 1719 is amended to read: "The printing, binding, and distribution costs of any publications distributed in accordance with this section shall be charged to appropriations provided the Superintendent of Documents for that purpose."

SEC. 307. For purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177), the term "program, project, and activity" shall be synonymous with each appropriation account in this Act, except that the accounts under the general heading "House of Representatives" shall be considered one "program, project, and activity".

This Act may be cited as the "Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1987".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against the bill?

Mr. COBEY. Mr. Chairman, I do have a point of order with regard to the language on page 10 having to do with official mail costs.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.



## POINT OF ORDER

Mr. COBEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 10, line 9, beginning with the word, "to," and all that follows on line 10, page 10.

Mr. Chairman, this is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill and as such is in violation of clause 2(b) of rule XXI.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, the committee concedes the point or order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GEPHARDT). The point of order is conceded and sustained. The language is stricken.

□ 1515

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBEY

Mr. COBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COBEY: Page 3, line 7, strike "\$48,000,000" and insert "\$43,691,570".

Mr. COBEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple. We all know as we go home each week, as I do, and as we get the responses from the people in our districts, still the No. 1 issue and the No. 1 problem viewed by our constituents and viewed by this Member is the fact that we have this appalling deficit each year. In fact, last year it was \$210 billion. This means that for 25 out of the last 26 years our Federal Government has spent more money than it has brought in. This year it looks like we are facing another budget deficit in the area of \$200 billion.

Now, as I look at this legislative appropriation bill, I recognize that \$1.3 billion is not an enormous part of a nearly \$1 trillion budget; however, the way I feel is that we in this body must set the example.

How can we look across America to people who are in need, how can we look at the national defense of our country if we are not willing to make these cuts here in the House of Representatives, or at least to hold the line?

Now, this past year, and I do not have the committee report before me, but for the salaries of committee staff, professional and clerical, we spent over \$42 million.

What I have done here, I have added the 3 percent that we are granting other Federal employees. That 3 percent brings us to \$43,691,570. There may be some hidden costs within here that I do not know about, but I do not believe that we should be doing any more for our committee staffs than we are for the Federal employees in general. I do not think in these times of enormous deficits that we should be adding staffs to committees. If anything, as we have normal attrition from retirement or people quitting, perhaps we could consolidate some jobs and consolidate some functions and save some money around here.

I think the key principle is that we need to show the people of this country that we are willing to hold the line right here in Congress. Even though, granted, it is just a few million dollars in a nearly trillion dollar budget, I think it is important for us to set the example.

It is simple. It is clear. It is a reduction from \$48 million down to \$43,691,570. I do not think that is going to be too much pain for anybody around here. I believe that we can live within this amount of money. It is a generous, generous amount of money.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I will be brief.

I simply would like to make clear to the gentleman from North Carolina the comments that were made earlier in the general debate that point out that we have reduced employment in this bill by 2 percent, 460 jobs. We have blocked 428 jobs, in effect not allowed them to be funded. We have abolished some 62 jobs.

We are in this account able to spend up to \$70 million, but the bill does not get anywhere near that amount. We are providing, as the gentleman indicated, \$48 million.

I think we have seen this year how important it is to have the resources available to handle the responsibilities that can be thrust upon our committees at any time. For example, I know Members on both sides of the aisle are working very diligently on a bipartisan drug package right now.

Where are we going to get the resources to have the staff to help us carry out that assignment?

I believe that the amounts that have been provided for the core committee staff allowed by the House rules, under rule 11, which the gentleman would amend, is properly funded. If we were to cut it any more, even as the gentleman indicates in a symbolic way, than we have already, we would be tying the hands of a very significant element of this legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a no vote on the amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the chairman of the Interior Committee, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I think I speak for most committee chairmen, or perhaps all of them, in saying that we have done our job or are doing our job. We have been responsible.

The committee has produced a bill that balances the need of this branch of the Government to be equal in the contest on a fair playing field to the executive branch, so I would hope that the amendment would be defeated and I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, and particularly may I say to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBEY], I want the gentleman to know that this Member is very sensitive to and appreciative of the gentleman's interest in seeing that the Congress restrains itself in its in-House expenditures across the board.

The amount that the gentleman suggests does not reflect a lot of money in limited dollar terms, but in terms of the work that we have done on this bill we have made very significant efforts to reflect the gentleman's concern, that is, to have Congress demonstrate that right here in its own House is committed to cutting the pattern of growth in Federal Government spending.

While I would resist this specific amendment and ask my Members to similarly resist it, we will as we go forward with the discussion of this bill and the amendments that will be before us have a number of opportunities to cut in other areas.

It seems to me that in this case, the gentleman is effectively testifying about his own concern regarding our levels of expense. At the same time, I would ask the gentleman to join me in serious consideration of some of the other amendments as well, and at this point I would ask for a "no" vote.

Mr. COBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Yes; I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COBEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the work of this committee and the pressure that they are under. I know it is not easy.

The gentleman from California, the committee chairman, indicated a number of positions had been cut back. I guess that reflects the sequestration order. That is a question I wanted to ask, the sequestration order under Gramm-Rudman, is that correct?

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, could the gentleman repeat that?

Mr. COBEY. The cutbacks to which the gentleman refers to the appropriation level of \$42 million this year, I know that is a post-Gramm-Rudman situation, are those the staff cuts necessitated by Gramm-Rudman?

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we accepted the cuts last year required by Gramm-Rudman. I am indicating that the \$48.3 million figure is a figure this committee has arrived at in the 1987 bill in light of the \$70 million that were available to us.

We are funding the existing staff at the current salary levels here. We are not attempting to add at all and we

have absorbed those cuts. I think we have done the proper thing.

Mr. COBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COBEY. If we are spending \$42 million this year in order to keep the salaries level, and in my amendment I show a 3-percent increase, why do we have to go to \$48 million? It must be that we are adding more staff or giving more than the 3 percent across the board, or 3 percent available for all other Federal employees. That is all I can conclude as I look at these figures.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Let me try to explain it in this way. If the gentleman will look at the details of our bill, the Budget Committee's estimate of new obligations and authority for the fiscal year 1987 were levels of \$51,135,000. That was the level of expenditure request anticipated.

The job of the subcommittee is to delve into those specific areas and attempt step by step to make cutbacks.

We have done that and that is reflected in the figure of \$48 million.

While I am not precisely responding to the detail of the gentleman's question, nevertheless we have tried to use a scalpel and not a machete in this process. This figure reflects the best the subcommittee could do.

Mr. COBEY. Well, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield again, I understand that. I know people are going to request what they think they need or what they think they can get and what they think is appropriate for their particular committee. I appreciate the fact the gentleman has taken it down from the request of \$51 million to \$48.

I guess I am approaching it from a different angle. I am starting to reflect that we are spending this year and feeling like we need to hold the line and just increase by 3 percent.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Well, Mr. Chairman, further responding to the gentleman, if one were to analyze the 1986 personnel budget approved for committees in the category that the gentleman is discussing, we had committee employees numbering 871 and standing committees and special and select committees numbering 1,225, for a total of 2,096.

In the 1987 recommended proposal, there are in committee employees 871, the exact same number of employees; and standing committees and special and select, 1,225, exactly the same number, totaling 2,096.

The adjustment seen here reflects some adjustments in general salaries, but there are some special merit increases, and so forth, that cause the figures not to be rounded out as evenly as we might like, but nonetheless reflect the committee's work.

I thank the gentleman for his question.

Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as the last exchange I think clearly pointed out, when it comes to Congress we use new methods of accounting. Obviously, if we are going to stick with the same number of employees and we are trying to provide them a 3-percent raise, we should be able to get by with a 3-percent increase in the amount of money spent for those committee employees; but of course, the fact of the matter is that there is some other money in there someplace and for what we are not exactly sure; but I would like to suggest to my Republican colleagues that as they look at this issues, they should be aware of the fact that when it comes to slicing up the pie for the committee slots in Congress, that we do not do too well. As a matter of fact, we not only do not do well, we get extremely shortchanged.

I have spent a little time trying to compile some information about the way in which staff ratios break down on committees in the House of Representatives.

Now, unlike the Senate, where the majority gets two-thirds of the committee staff and the minority gets one-third of the committee staff, in the House of Representatives it is hard to find a committee where the Republicans, the minority, have even 25 percent of the staff.

For example on the committee which has the largest number of employees, the Energy and Commerce Committee, the majority staff takes fully 85 percent of the staff slots and the minority gets 15 percent of the staff slots.

The same is true of the Committee on Government Operations. We have an 81-19 breakdown, 81 percent going to the majority, 19 percent to the minority on the Science and Technology Committee, and we could go on down the list.

These investigative staff slots that are opened up are particularly interesting. For example, in the Judiciary Committee there are 49 members on the Democratic staff for investigative purposes, 5 on the Republican staff.

Now, I know as well as most of us in this Chamber know that probably every Republican staff member is worth two or three on the other side of the aisle; but the fact still is that we are being seriously shortchanged on the minority side when it comes to the appointment of the staff, and when we put more money into the legislative appropriation, that is not more money to top the Republican side of the aisle research issues in order to participate fully in the debate. Instead, what it is, is more money that is split in a grievously unfair manner that helps the

Democrats have an overwhelming research, mailing, and other support staff, that is unfair to us.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAUKE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman is a fair-minded individual. I know the gentleman is sincere in his point, but I would want to put on the record that this is the rule 11 funding and it says in the rule itself that a third of the staff will be available to the minority.

So I do not believe there is much jurisdiction, much discretion for any chairman or subcommittee chairman to really hurt the minority inordinately. In fact, I am sure in some cases the minority does better. Maybe there is some flexibility, depending on the relationships between ranking minority members and the chairman.

But in the rule itself which provides for this guarantee of 30 professional staff per committee, the minority is protected.

□ 1530

Mr. TAUKE. I appreciate the point that the gentleman has made, because it is true that in this particular rule that we have under discussion at the moment that there is some protection for the minority, but on a general basis the minority has virtually no protection when it comes to the providing of funds for committee staff. I guess that that is the general point that I am making, that if we are going to throw more money into this legislative appropriation, that we should be fully aware of the fact that most of that money is going to support the majority staff in what is obviously an unfair apportionment of those funds.

It is my view that the only clout that the Republicans of the minority have is to withhold our votes from requests for unseemly increases in funding as we are being asked to provide at the current time.

Mr. COBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAUKE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COBEY. Mr. Chairman, a quick calculation of this increase from post-Grumm-Rudman figures, a little over \$42 million, to \$48 million, shows an increase of over 13 percent, a little over 13 percent. That is far more than the 3 percent available to other Federal workers, and far more—we know that we see negotiations around the country, in Philadelphia and in Detroit, and we know what is going on there—and this I think is just highly inappropriate, especially in these times.

A quick calculation here of an increase of \$5,500,000 for 2,000 employ-



ees comes out to \$2,800 apiece. I do not know where all that money goes.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I was confused by some of this discussion. The gentleman from North Carolina says, and I think properly, that if you take last year's expenditure number and add 3 percent, you should cover handsomely all the employees—not handsomely, but with the same increase that we intend to give through the bureaucracy and to legislative employees. With 3 percent, they should all be covered. As a matter of fact, if Gramm-Rudman was effective, and we actually made some real cuts, we would have less employees on hand at the end of the fiscal year, and 3 percent would be more than enough to cover the 3 percent pay raise.

The distinguished chairman says no, we are just giving everybody a normal raise. Can the chairman explain that a little better to me, please?

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENZEL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to just reiterate that this is that area of the rules that provides each standing committee with their 30 professional staff—two-thirds to the majority and one-third to the minority. We fund those 30 and provide for an amount that is in accord with normal compensation for merit or cost-of-living increases. We have done nothing more than that.

I think that there are committees that probably are using this source perhaps more than they may have in the past, but I do not think that we are recommending an inordinate amount of money, given the responsibilities that our committees have here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. FRENZEL. The gentleman talked about the figure of \$70 million. Would that be the number if each committee took its 30 slots and allotted them at maximum salary?

Mr. FAZIO. That is correct.

Mr. FRENZEL. OK. And the \$51 million is what your staff estimated would be spent out if we maintained the same standing rate.

Mr. FAZIO. That was the request that was made of us. We reduced that request by \$3.1 million.

Mr. FRENZEL. That was what was asked of you.

Mr. FAZIO. We reduced that to \$48 million.

Mr. FRENZEL. Your problem, if we can continue, is that this is mandatory, and you have no choice about funding it if the committees choose to use this much.

Mr. FAZIO. Under the allowance made in the rule, we make an assumption about the level at which the com-

mittees will make use of this allowance and we try to approximate in the appropriations process what we think is reasonable.

Mr. FRENZEL. I am not sure that I disagree with you on the rule XI employees, but let your eye run down then to the standing, select, and special committees, which we call the investigative staff. Do you consider that to be a mandatory funding as well?

Mr. FAZIO. I believe, in order to deal with the requirements that the committee chairmen and ranking members have, that we have to consider both of these in that category.

Mr. FRENZEL. I thank the chairman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, our problem here is that we have the rule XI staff, the statutory staff, and we also have the investigative staff. Between them, they will cost \$90 million this year. Then, in addition, you have the CBO staff, the OTA staff, the Appropriations Committee staff, the budget staff. When you throw all those numbers together, you are well into the hundreds of millions of dollars.

It is true that some of these are mandatory, or would seem to be. My position is, however, that if we would exercise some real diligence and try to keep the lid on all these expenditures, we could make what seem to be mandatory expenditures into discretionary expenditures. Then we could, in fact, exert some discipline on ourselves.

Mr. COBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENZEL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COBEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Minnesota and his great knowledge on this subject. One point that I wanted to bring out is the fact that we face possible sequestration under Gramm-Rudman, come the fall, and I do not want to say that there are any motives here—in fact, I am not saying that—but in a sense, by raising it to \$48 million, these committee staff salaries, in a sense we give that area a cushion that if sequestration comes along, the committees and their staffs will not have to cut back, like many other programs that are hit by sequestration, if those people are not already hired.

In a sense, this becomes a mechanism to protect committee staffs from sequestration under Gramm-Rudman. I am not saying that was the intent at all, but that is how it would work out.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, of course I can preface my comments with my usual regards to the committee, and as usual they are sincere. I was kidding a

member of the Committee on Appropriations earlier today that we may have to call you the turnip committee because you defend your turf very well.

This amendment intrigues me, and I was particularly intrigued by the comments from the gentleman from Iowa, because there is a pattern here, a pattern that he talked about, and one that I think in effect we need to focus on, looking at it from the point of view that he raised that indeed by the staffing of Congress we load the dice in favor of the majority party as opposed to the minority party.

I think that the numbers are very clear there, and it is fairly clear to me that if you look at the staff numbers, looking at investigative staff, that rule XI certainly comes apart. But even when you allow the rule XI, I find it interesting that 42 percent of the membership of the House are afforded something like a third of the seats on committees and a third of the staff, and that is an old story.

That is an interesting story, but one that frankly is a little more partisan than I would like to be, but I would like to take a look at it from the other point of view. Let us think of committees as special-interest groups that are fostering and encouraging programs in which the members of the committee, and especially the leadership members of the committee on both sides, have invested a great deal of their political careers and a good deal of their constituents' interests. Then we see that the committee has a built-in interest in either extending spending or at least protecting from any cuts in spending.

There are a great many of us that have worked long and hard trying to find ways to make spending cuts on a line-item-by-line-item basis. The staff that we have to help us do the research and the investigation is our own congressional staff, and let me tell you, mine gets spread very, very thinly as my young staff works anywhere from 8 in the morning to 11 at night, and on weekends, trying to catch up with all the facts and figures and information that we have to work.

We do not have committee staff to help out on this process. When we come to the floor to present our amendments, we present them against the background work of enormous committee staffs, so that in effect you can say it is the public interest running against the special interests where we staff the special-interest committees.

I am not going to quarrel with anybody's work on a committee that way. I understand that, and naturally each and every one of us as a representative of our district understands our responsibility to represent our district.

□ 1540

Somebody said something earlier in this debate about a fair playing field. I am going to suggest to you that those who are committed to cutting spending do not have a fair playing field with those that are committed to increasing spending, or at least holding from cuts in spending.

The thing that tilts the playing field in favor of more spending is the committee staff that the spending side has to support its work as over and against the other side trying to make spending cuts. So this becomes a crucial amendment if we are going to get to the heart of the process by which this body year in and year out spends too much of the taxpayers' money.

I would suggest that one thing we might want to give serious consideration to is that the House has too many committees. For the life of me, I do not know the value of a select committee if it is not political posturing back home. I will tell you that whether you are a majority or minority members. I do not understand why you want to be on a committee that has no ability to bring legislation to the floor of the House.

But it gets staffed; it gets funded. It spends time, generally back in the committee members' districts, holding hearings so that that Member can demonstrate his concern over the problem.

That is what we are spending our money for. I am going to suggest to the Members of this body that if we can ever get to where we ought to be, fewer committees, fewer committee staffs, more work done by the Members of the bodies, less deference to what I have come to call the sovereignties of the committees, vote "yes" on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBEY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. COBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 237, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 256]

## AYES—172

Applegate	Boehlert	Combest
Archer	Boulter	Conte
Arney	Breaux	Coughlin
Badham	Brown (CO)	Courter
Bartlett	Burton (IN)	Craig
Barton	Callahan	Crane
Bateman	Chandler	Daniel
Bedell	Chappie	Dannemeyer
Bennett	Cheney	Darden
Bentley	Coats	Daschle
Bereuter	Cobey	Daub
Bilirakis	Coble	DeLay
Bliley	Coleman (MO)	DeWine

Dickinson	Lloyd	Sharp	Miller (CA)	Rahall	Stark
Dornan (CA)	Loeffler	Shaw	Mineta	Rangel	Stokes
Dreier	Lott	Shumway	Mitchell	Reid	Stratton
Duncan	Lowery (CA)	Shuster	Moakley	Richardson	Studds
Eckert (NY)	Lujan	Siljander	Molinari	Rinaldo	Swift
Edwards (OK)	Lungren	Skeen	Mollohan	Rodino	Synar
Emerson	Mack	Slattery	Montgomery	Roe	Taylor
Erdreich	Martin (IL)	Slaughter	Moody	Rose	Thomas (GA)
Evans (IA)	McCain	Smith (NE)	Morrison (CT)	Rostenkowski	Torres
Fawell	McCandless	Smith, Denny	Mrazek	Rowland (GA)	Townes
Fiedler	McCloskey	(OR)	Murphy	Roybal	Traffant
Fields	McCollum	Smith, Robert	Murtha	Rudd	Traxler
Fish	McEwen	(NH)	Myers	Russo	Udall
Franklin	McKernan	Smith, Robert	Natcher	Sabo	Vento
Frenzel	McMillan	(OR)	Neal	Savage	Visclosky
Gallo	Meyers	Snowe	Nelson	Scheuer	Watkins
Gekas	Michel	Solomon	Nichols	Schroeder	Waxman
Gilman	Miller (OH)	Spence	Nowak	Schumer	Weiss
Goodling	Miller (WA)	Stallings	Oakar	Seiberling	Wheat
Gradison	Monson	Stenholm	Oberstar	Shelby	Whitley
Gregg	Moorhead	Strang	Obey	Sikorski	Whitten
Hall, Ralph	Morrison (WA)	Stump	Olin	Siskis	Williams
Hammerschmidt	Nielsen	Sundquist	Ortiz	Skelton	Wilson
Hansen	O.ley	Sweeney	Owens	Smith (FL)	Wirth
Hendon	Packard	Swindall	Panetta	Smith (IA)	Wise
Henry	Penny	Tallon	Pashayan	Smith (NJ)	Wolpe
Hiler	Petri	Tauke	Pease	Snyder	Wright
Holt	Porter	Tauzin	Pepper	Solarz	Wyden
Hopkins	Pursell	Thomas (CA)	Perkins	Spratt	Yates
Huckaby	Ray	Torricelli	Pickle	St Germain	Yatron
Hunter	Regula	Valentine	Price	Staggers	Young (AK)
Hutto	Ridge	Vander Jagt	Quillen	Stangeland	Young (MO)
Hyde	Ritter	Volkmer			
Ireland	Roberts	Vucanovich			
Jacobs	Robinson	Walgren			
Johnson	Roemer	Walker			
Kasich	Rogers	Weber			
Kemp	Roth	Whitehurst			
Kindness	Roukema	Whittaker			
Kolbe	Rowland (CT)	Wolf			
Kramer	Saxton	Wortley			
Lagomarsino	Schaefer	Wylie			
Latta	Schneider	Young (FL)			
Leach (IA)	Schuette	Zschau			
Lewis (FL)	Schulze				
Lightfoot	Sensenbrenner				

## NOES—237

Ackerman	Dicks	Howard
Akaka	Dingell	Hoyer
Alexander	Dixon	Hubbard
Anderson	Donnelly	Hughes
Andrews	Dorgan (ND)	Jeffords
Annunzio	Dowdy	Jenkins
Anthony	Downey	Jones (NC)
Aspin	Durbin	Jones (OK)
Atkins	Dwyer	Jones (TN)
AuCoin	Dymally	Kanjorski
Bates	Dyson	Kaptur
Beilenson	Early	Kastenmeier
Berman	Eckart (OH)	Kennelly
Bevill	Edwards (CA)	Kildee
Blaggi	English	Kleczka
Boggs	Evans (IL)	Kolter
Boland	Fascell	Kostmayer
Boner (TN)	Fazio	LaFalce
Bonior (MI)	Florio	Lantos
Bonker	Foglietta	Leath (TX)
Borski	Foley	Lehman (CA)
Bosco	Ford (MI)	Lehman (FL)
Boucher	Ford (TN)	Lent
Boxer	Frank	Levin (MI)
Brooks	Frost	Levine (CA)
Broomfield	Fuqua	Lewis (CA)
Brown (CA)	Garcia	Lipinski
Bruce	Gaydos	Livingston
Bryant	Gejdenson	Long
Burton (CA)	Gephardt	Lowry (WA)
Bustamante	Gibbons	Lukens
Byron	Glickman	Lundine
Carper	Gonzalez	MacKay
Carr	Gordon	Madigan
Chapman	Gray (IL)	Manton
Chappell	Gray (PA)	Markay
Clay	Green	Martinez
Clinger	Guarini	Matsui
Coelho	Hall (OH)	Mavroules
Coleman (TX)	Hamilton	Mazzoli
Conyers	Hatcher	McCurdy
Cooper	Hawkins	McDade
Coyne	Hayes	McGrath
Davis	Hefner	McHugh
de la Garza	Hertel	McKinney
Dellums	Hillis	Mica
Derrick	Horton	Mikulski

## NOT VOTING—22

Barnard	Feighan	Marlenee
Barnes	Filippo	Martin (NY)
Campbell	Fowler	Moore
Carney	Gingrich	Parris
Collins	Grothberg	Waldon
Crockett	Gunderson	Weaver
DioGuardi	Hartnett	
Edgar	Leland	

□ 1600

Mr. SEIBERLING changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. TALLON, WYLIE, and KINDNESS and Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SWINDALL

Mr. SWINDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered by Mr. SWINDALL: Page 14, line 13, strike "\$25,227,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$25,135,550."

Mr. SWINDALL. Mr. Chairman, I also ask unanimous consent to offer two amendments which I have at the desk en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PANETTA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I object to the offering en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. SWINDALL. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I can still remember some 19 months ago after being sworn in to this august body the President of the United States inviting each of the freshman Members and their spouse to the White House for a get-acquainted dinner.

At that dinner he shared an anecdote about a freshman Member of Congress who went over to George-



town with a Member of the Senate and a member of the administration to discuss, undoubtedly, a piece of legislation, that kept them in Georgetown until the wee hours of the morning.

They came out to the Congressman's car, only to have the Congressman discover that he had locked his keys in the car. At that point he turned to his two colleagues and told them he was going back into the restaurant to get a coathanger so he could pry the lock open. At that point the gentleman from the Senate said he really did not think that that was a good idea. He was afraid somebody would misunderstand what he was doing and that before they could explain themselves they would find headlines the next morning saying that they had been caught in Georgetown breaking into a car.

Well, at that point the Congressman said he agreed, and what would the Senator suggest. The Senator said, "Well, I think I have a pocket knife that I think I can cut just enough of the rubber so that I can slip my finger in and unlock the door." Well, at that point the Congressman shook his head and said, "I don't think that's a very good idea either. I am afraid somebody will see what you are doing and think that you are just too stupid to know how to use a coathanger."

Well, at that point the fellow from the State Department who had been watching all of this transpire looked at both of them and said, "Frankly, I don't care how you resolve it, I just hope you do it in a hurry because it is getting ready to rain and, frankly, I am afraid you are not going to get into it in time to put your top up."

The point the President was making was that sometimes we get so caught up in the big picture that we fail to see the smaller picture, the detail.

I think that is certainly true with respect to the appropriations process.

Mr. Chairman, as we look at an appropriations process that will ultimately approach \$1 trillion, it is certainly easy to think that \$100,000, \$200,000, even a \$1 million appropriation is not significant. What my amendment which strikes \$25,227,000 and substitutes the figure of \$25,135,550, which is basically a \$91,450 reduction to eliminate automatic elevator operators is exactly the type of issue that we all must recognize infuriates our constituents who recognize that they are making real sacrifices as we face deficit reduction measures. And here we are in our own House office buildings paying people literally \$13,000 a year on a part-time basis to punch automatic elevator buttons.

My amendment does not fire anyone. It was drafted very carefully not to fire anyone but, rather, to recognize that over the last 3 years we have had exactly 100 percent turnover

in the positions of automatic elevator operator in the House office buildings.

Specifically, there are 14 of these individuals. The total budget is \$182,900. My amendment, if adopted, which I am sure it will be, would reduce in half that amount so that we simply do not replace these individuals as they resign.

I think it is important that we recognize that, while \$91,500 may not be a great deal—of course, many people could buy a couple of homes for that amount—it is very important that we set the example in our own appropriations.

Certainly if you look at the absurdity of having automatic elevator operators and paying them that type of money, it is evident that it is a selfish luxury. I think more so than any other Member of this body, I have the right to offer this amendment because my office is literally the furthest office from this Capitol floor. I am on the fifth floor of the Cannon Building, and it literally takes me no longer than 6 minutes to walk here. I am sure many of my colleagues up on the fifth floor can relate to that.

So my point is this: We do not need to be throwing away taxpayers' dollars to pay patronage jobs.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. SWINDALL] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SWINDALL was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SWINDALL. My point is these are patronage positions. I have heard arguments that they are handicapped individuals, that they are minorities, that they are senior citizens. That simply is not true.

I have checked, and they are not any of those capacities. They are patronage positions, and we pay literally \$13,000 for patronage at times when individuals are being asked to take freezes in cost-of-living adjustments and what have you.

One other point I would make is that is utterly illogical to have, as we have, for example, in the Cannon Office Building, a 4-foot by 3-foot 9-inch elevator consumed with an extra body that sits in a chair. If you go at any time to the No. 6 elevator in the Cannon House Office Building, you will find what I find when this individual is in her post: an individual sitting in a chair talking on a telephone and reading a book. I will never forget 3 weeks ago I got on that elevator, hoping to go immediately down to the bottom floor, as I had been promised, only to find that we made five stops and it took me longer to get there. And I was actually told by the Architect's Office that the purpose of this automatic elevator operator is to keep the elevator moving quickly so that Members can go rapidly to the floor.

So they are not even serving that purpose. I think we should close this argument by recognizing that the Senate did this 5 years ago. They eliminated the automatic elevator operators for their own Senate office buildings, and they seem to be faring just as well without them. I think that we can follow their prudent example by saying that we will at least do that ourselves by not rehiring individuals as they resign.

I thank the Chairman.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia on a very fervent rendition, in his presentation to the body. I have no desire to criticize my friend from Colorado Mr. BROWN, who has offered this amendment so frequently in recent years, but I must say I think the gentleman deserves an Oscar for his performance.

Mr. SWINDALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FAZIO. This is an amendment that is often handed out to newer Members, and I do not think anyone has ever carried out this responsibility with any greater elan than the gentleman has.

Mr. SWINDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I would be more than happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. SWINDALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that the reason that I accepted this responsibility was that when I ran last time, I found that of all the issues that I talked about in defeating a five-term incumbent was the electorate was outraged by our spending money for automatic elevator operators. They could not believe that we actually are paying money for people to punch buttons that we ourselves can punch.

I yield back.

Mr. FAZIO. I appreciate the gentleman's comment. I would simply say that when the electorate hears only one side of any given issue, it may well be that they become outraged. I hope that in the next several minutes, and I hope not to take the entire time, we could do something that would remove some of the outrage and perhaps balance the equation a little bit.

A little bit of history is always useful. In fact, I seem to have to recite it every year this time.

This amendment, as the gentleman said, is aimed at 14 people, many of them are elderly, some are disabled. They are by definition lower-income people who earn \$13,000 per year.

To put it in perspective, there are 67 elevators in the House office buildings. Of these, only six have operators. A

number of people are relatively new to these jobs, but there are individuals who have been in them since October 1968, for example. I think the average citizen does not understand that, unlike the Senate, that has no time limit on their votes. Members of the House are required to be on the House floor within 15 minutes after a quorum or vote is ordered. Therefore, it is important that we have the help of these individuals to expedite the operation of the elevators so that we answer the rollcalls that we are required to make to perform our duties for our colleagues and for our constituents.

We originally had 52 operators in the House office buildings a decade ago. That has now been reduced down to a point where we have only 14 people. I believe it is responsible for us to maintain those 14 people who are necessary since they work two shifts. I think it would be a very imprudent reduction.

The Members of this body have been through this exercise many times before. I would hope they would vote "no," and I hope we could go to a vote quickly.

Mr. SWINDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. If I must, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SWINDALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me first of all say that I have searched and found that the statement with respect to these individuals being handicapped or elderly is simply not true with respect to the House office buildings.

Mr. FAZIO. If I could reclaim my time, I would urge that Members simply use their powers of observation, and they could rebut that argument.

Mr. SWINDALL. And second, let me make this observation, that even if that were true I think that we need to be sensitive to the elderly, handicapped and minority and low-income individuals whose taxpayer dollars are going to finance this type of nonsense.

Mr. FAZIO. I appreciate the gentleman's comment, and I reclaim my time.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I would be happy to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. LUNGREN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just wonder, since we are having a problem getting our mail delivered and we seem to be able to get over here, maybe we could transfer them to sort mail and might satisfy a couple of problems that are affecting the Members.

Mr. FAZIO. I have had a number of individuals on both sides of the aisle indicate a concern about the arrival time of their mail, and I can say that,

without reprogramming funds, Mr. Rota has been able to make some economies and we now have an increase in personnel in order to ensure that our mail does arrive in our offices in a relatively rapid manner.

□ 1615

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is a special problem for those of us who choose to reside in the Longworth Building. I supported Mr. BROWN of Colorado in his earlier attempts for these cutbacks, but I assure you that if you do not have Jim or Catherine or Patrick in those elevators, many times they do not work.

Having been on an elevator whose door would not open during a vote, I can assure the gentleman and also my colleague from Georgia with whose intent I respect, that does present a problem.

So for those Longworth dwellers, we do have a special problem.

I hasten to add I do not know what it would cost to modernize the elevators in Longworth so they can go with the same kind of speed with regard to our other House office buildings and over in the Senate. But we do have a special problem in Longworth.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments, having been in the Longworth most of the time that I have been in Congress.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PANETTA). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. SWINDALL].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SWINDALL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 168, noes 238, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 257]

#### AYES—168

Archer	Cobey	Eckert (NY)
Armey	Coble	Edwards (OK)
Badham	Coleman (MO)	Emerson
Bartlett	Combest	Erdreich
Barton	Conte	Fawell
Bennett	Courter	Fiedler
Bereuter	Craig	Fields
Billakis	Crane	Frenzel
Billey	Daniel	Gallo
Boulter	Dannemeyer	Gekas
Brown (CO)	Darden	Gibbons
Burton (IN)	Daub	Gillman
Byron	DeLay	Gingrich
Callahan	Derrick	Glickman
Carper	DeWine	Goodling
Chandler	DioGuardi	Gradison
Cheney	Dornan (CA)	Gregg
Clinger	Dreier	Hall, Ralph
Coats	Dyson	Hamilton

Hansen	McEwen	Siljander
Hendon	McMillan	Slattery
Henry	Michel	Slaughter
Hiler	Miller (OH)	Smith (NE)
Hillis	Miller (WA)	Smith (NJ)
Hopkins	Monson	Smith, Denny
Hubbard	Montgomery	(OR)
Huckaby	Moorhead	Smith, Robert
Hunter	Morrison (WA)	(NH)
Hyde	Nelson	Smith, Robert
Ireland	Nielson	(OR)
Jenkins	Olin	Snowe
Johnson	Oxley	Solomon
Jones (OK)	Packard	Spratt
Kanjorski	Pashayan	Stallings
Kasich	Pease	Strang
Kindness	Petri	Stump
Kolbe	Pursell	Sundquist
Kramer	Ray	Sweeney
Lagomarsino	Ridge	Swindall
Latta	Rinaldo	Tallon
Leach (IA)	Ritter	Tauke
Lewis (FL)	Roberts	Tauzin
Lightfoot	Robinson	Thomas (CA)
Livingston	Rogers	Thomas (GA)
Lloyd	Roth	Torricelli
Loeffler	Roukema	Valentine
Lott	Rowland (CT)	Vander Jagt
Luken	Saxton	Volkmer
Lungren	Schaefer	Walker
Mack	Schneider	Weber
MacKay	Schroeder	Whittaker
Madigan	Schuetz	Wirth
Martin (IL)	Schulze	Wolf
Martin (NY)	Sensenbrenner	Wolpe
McCaIn	Shaw	Wylie
McCandless	Shumway	Young (FL)
McDade	Shuster	Zschau

#### NOES—238

Ackerman	Dowdy	Kennelly
Akaka	Downey	Kildee
Alexander	Duncan	Kleczka
Anderson	Durbin	Kolter
Annunzio	Dwyer	Kostmayer
Anthony	Dymally	LaFalce
Applegate	Early	Lantos
Aspin	Eckart (OH)	Lehman (CA)
Atkins	Edwards (CA)	Lehman (FL)
AuCoin	English	Leland
Bateman	Evans (IA)	Lent
Bates	Evans (IL)	Levin (MI)
Bedell	Fascell	Levine (CA)
Beilenson	Fazio	Lewis (CA)
Bentley	Fish	Lipinski
Berman	Flippo	Long
Bevill	Florio	Lowery (CA)
Biaggi	Foglietta	Lowry (WA)
Boehert	Foley	Lujan
Boggs	Ford (MI)	Manton
Boland	Ford (TN)	Markay
Boner (TN)	Frank	Martinez
Bonior (MI)	Franklin	Matsui
Bonker	Frost	Mavroules
Borski	Fuqua	Mazzoli
Boucher	Garcia	McCloskey
Boxer	Gaydos	McCollum
Brooks	Gejdenson	McCurdy
Broomfield	Gephardt	McGrath
Brown (CA)	Gonzalez	McHugh
Bruce	Gordon	McKernan
Bryant	Gray (IL)	McKinney
Burton (CA)	Gray (PA)	Meyers
Bustamante	Green	Mica
Carr	Guarini	Mikulski
Chapman	Hall (OH)	Miller (CA)
Chappell	Hammerschmidt	Mineta
Chapple	Hatcher	Mitchell
Clay	Hawkins	Moakley
Coelho	Hayes	Mollinari
Coleman (TX)	Hefner	Mollohan
Conyers	Hertel	Moody
Cooper	Holt	Morrison (CT)
Coughlin	Horton	Mrazek
Coyne	Howard	Murphy
Daschle	Hoyer	Murtha
Davis	Hughes	Myers
de la Garza	Hutto	Natcher
Dellums	Jacobs	Neal
Dickinson	Jeffords	Nichols
Dicks	Jones (NC)	Nowak
Dingell	Jones (TN)	Oakar
Dixon	Kaptur	Oberstar
Donnelly	Kastenmeier	Obey
Dorgan (ND)	Kemp	Ortiz



Owens	Schumer	Traxler
Panetta	Seiberling	Udall
Penny	Sharp	Vento
Pepper	Shelby	Visclosky
Perkins	Sikorski	Vucanovich
Pickle	Sisisky	Waldon
Porter	Skeen	Walgren
Price	Skelton	Watkins
Quillen	Smith (IA)	Waxman
Rahall	Snyder	Weiss
Rangel	Solarz	Wheat
Regula	Spence	Whitehurst
Reid	St Germain	Whitley
Richardson	Staggers	Whitten
Rodino	Stangeland	Williams
Roe	Stark	Wilson
Rose	Stokes	Wise
Rostenkowski	Stratton	Wright
Rowland (GA)	Studds	Wyden
Roybal	Swift	Yates
Rudd	Synar	Yatron
Russo	Taylor	Young (AK)
Sabo	Torres	Young (MO)
Savage	Towns	
Scheuer	Trafigant	

## NOT VOTING—25

Andrews	Edgar	Moore
Barnard	Feighan	Parris
Barnes	Fowler	Roemer
Bosco	Grothberg	Smith (FL)
Breaux	Gunderson	Stenholm
Campbell	Hartnett	Weaver
Carney	Leath (TX)	Wortley
Collins	Lundine	
Crockett	Marlenee	

□ 1635

Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. McCLOSKEY changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRENZEL

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRENZEL: On page 29, after line 18, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 308. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act, except for the payment to Grace Adabbo specified in the item relating to 'Payments to widows and heirs of deceased Members of Congress,' and except for the payment to the Office of the Chaplain specified in the item relating to 'Salaries Officers and Employees' in Title I, shall be reduced by 3.51 percent."

Mr. FRENZEL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PANETTA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask if the gentleman would indicate whether this is his across-the-board amendment?

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it is my across-the-board amendment.

Mr. FAZIO. Then if it is, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 40 minutes, the time to be divided equally between the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] and myself.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. FRENZEL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman suggest 20 minutes?

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will be more than happy to accommodate the gentleman and, I am sure, all our colleagues with 20 minutes.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The time to be provided on this amendment is 20 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL].

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California, the distinguished subcommittee chairman and I have agreed on 20 minutes of debate because we have debated a number of these across-the-board amendments returning spending to the higher authority amount of 1986. The numbers are different in each bill.

The gentleman from California and I have agreed to this reduction in time so that the Members would have a chance to go about their business at the end of the day and both of us would be indebted to the membership if we could have order so that we could move this right along. It may be possible to do this in less than 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I sent a "Dear Colleague" letter. Those of you who scanned it will understand that this year's appropriation is up about \$46.2 million over last year's appropriation sub-sequestered.

Now, that is about \$3.62 million above last year's appropriation, so my amendment cuts across the board 3.51 percent in an attempt to get our spending down to last year's level, that is to enact a BA freeze.

Now, there are two very small items in the appropriation that are excepted. One is the Chaplain's Office, because there is only one person in it. His salary is the whole amount. The other is payment to a widow of the House of Representatives, again the only amount in that item. I felt it was inappropriate to cut those two amounts, so I split my 3.51 cut across the rest of the budget.

Mr. Chairman, I am doing this because I think it is exceedingly impor-

tant that the House get its appropriations down to a rock bottom level so that when our sequester resolution comes along, we will be able to pass a very small sequester resolution and still meet our targets.

I realize all the objections to an across-the-board amendment. They are many and numerous and I would agree with them.

There are some advantages, however, in that they ratify the imperative spending decisions made by the subcommittee so that I do not pick out one item that they like and I do not like.

What I have done is said all the items will remain the same proportion with those two small exceptions that the committee decided on, and I will make a small cut, if possible, across the board, so that we will be able to get to last year's BA.

Mr. Chairman, it is awfully easy when we are dealing with certain appropriations to take shots. I do not want to do anything that smacks of that kind of activity.

I do feel that it is appropriate, however, to suggest that this is the part of our budget that is fully spent on ourselves and our own activities. If we are going to allow ourselves these very large increases, and I pointed out in the scheduled debate that congressional operations budgets are increased over 6 percent, very nearly by 7 percent.

As a matter of fact, some of our functions, like our caucus and our conference, are increased nearly 20 percent.

I believe that if the House will make the decision that it will stand for some cuts, that it will stand for a freeze in its total operation, then we will be prepared to do good things on the reconciliation and on the sequester resolution and we will be able to tell the people of this country that we were willing to make a sacrifice first and then we asked it of everybody else.

I believe that the freeze amendment is good budget policy. It will make our lives easier when it comes time for sequestration and that it will not unnecessarily inconvenience any of our committees or ourselves.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I do not need to make a lengthy defense of this budget because I think most Members understand that it is rather austere and it has been done in good faith on a bipartisan basis.

If we adopt this Frenzel amendment to cut across the board by 3.5 percent, we have in fact made a decision, and I hope we do not make it, but if we were to accept this amendment, we will have frozen our budget for the second year in a row. This would be another freeze at the sequestered level. In other words, adopted a freeze budget last year and saw it cut 4.3 percent by

Gramm-Rudman. This amendment would freeze it again.

My colleagues and my friends, this cuts at the vitals of this very important legislative branch of our Federal Government. It would do disastrous damage to our ability to uphold our constitutional duties.

We have been exceedingly responsible in the way we have marked up this bill. Since 1985 we have increased the funds by less than four-tenths of 1 percent each year. I am not aware of any other program in Government that has had that kind of restriction.

We have had a great deal of debate on all the other appropriations bills about whether we met the test of the budget resolution. I want to make clear to everyone that we have met it not only on budget authority, but we have met it on outlays as well. We have done everything that has been asked of us.

We have, I think, a responsible budget which is over last year's sequestered amount by 3.5 percent. Before Gramm-Rudman, the bill is actually down by \$9.1 million.

I might point out that the executive branch request is up by 4 percent.

The CPI is projected by the Congressional Budget Office to go up by more than 4 percent. We are under both of those.

This is not a new phenomenon. The legislative branch since 1978 has averaged annual increases of only 5.8 percent. That is significantly below the executive branch increases of 8.9 percent, and less than the Consumer Price Index average increase of 6.3 percent since 1978.

In fact, therefore, we have had a decline in the legislative branch funding in real dollars since 1978.

We all understand what Gramm-Rudman has brought about. Members are complaining here on the floor of the 6- or 7-day delay in mail deliveries—I see the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MILLER], he mentioned it to me today—in getting mail from the mail room in the Capitol to Members' offices.

But this does not just affect congressional operations or Members of Congress. This affects the entire legislative branch of Government. It means we are cutting back on the GAO. We are cutting back on the General Accounting Office in the face of increased responsibilities.

It means that despite their new responsibilities under Gramm-Rudman, this amendment would cut back some \$600,000 on the Congressional Budget Office.

The GAO cut was \$11 million.

It means a cut back on the Office of Technology assessment.

It seems cuts in the Library of Congress that many, many people have written Congress in protest about; this would impose further cuts in the Li-

brary of Congress of some \$6.6 million, making it difficult for the blind and the physically handicapped to receive services, making it difficult to preserve the many valuable works of art and texts that are deteriorating, forcing premature closure of the reading rooms, making reductions in copyright protection activities and so forth.

If this amendment is approved and a Gramm-Rudman sequestration order is approved on top of that, the legislative branch will suffer drastically and I believe in such a manner as to make our ability to perform our services next to impossible.

We cannot trade off cutbacks in grants and loans and contract authority. We take it on the chin. We have to fire staff and give up computer resources.

It would be counterproductive. I hope Members will stick with the committee in its responsible effort. We are not even restoring the Gramm-Rudman cuts. We have simply presented the Members a bill that continues the downward trend in employment and a responsible level of fiscal expenditure.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to express my respect and appreciation for the task that the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and his committee have undertaken in bringing this legislation to the floor. I know that Chairman FAZIO does not have an easy job in putting together a legislative appropriation bill and it is a thankless job, because regardless of what kind of appropriation measure you bring to the floor, it is going to be controversial and it is going to invite amendments.

My concern is in sticking to a principle which I think serves us well long term and that is to hold funding levels at a freeze level on all the appropriation bills that reach the floor.

□ 1650

We all know that Gramm-Rudman sequestration faces us if we do not keep our spending measures within bounds. One of the easiest ways in my judgment to hold the line on spending is to simply say in every category that we will spend no more.

This appropriation bill, like several before it, has a somewhat higher funding level than we are spending at in this current fiscal year. The only way in which we can get it back to a freeze level is to adopt an amendment like the Frenzel amendment. With the Frenzel amendment we will bring spending in this bill back down to the post sequestration funding level for fiscal year 1986. If we carry that lower funding level forward, we stand a better chance of avoiding sequestra-

tion in the coming year. If we do face sequestration in the coming year, by freezing these appropriation bills as they come along we will face a less stringent, a less difficult, a less deep sequestration of our spending in various categories.

Again, if we want to make budget decisions less painful down the road, it seems appropriate that we take a bite out of these appropriation bills as they come to the floor by adopting a freeze amendment. I again encourage Members to take seriously the amendment offered by Mr. FRENZEL. This amendment will bring this bill down to a freeze level, and I think that it ought to be adopted.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS].

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Chairman, it is not the most pleasant duty to serve on the Subcommittee on Accounts, under the able leadership of Chairman ANNUNZIO. At one time it maybe had been considered pleasant, and a good spot, but today, the last 2 or 3 years we have been in a very difficult position.

The maker of the amendment serves on that committee with me, and I think that he would agree with me before this whole body that we were pretty tightfisted last year, and we cut things down substantially. We were accused of being unreasonable, and I as a chairman had to repeatedly and am repeatedly turning down many chairmen's requests for additional funds.

I will give you a good practical example. Chairman ROBINO needed funds desperately. He had to bypass our committee and go a special route and ask for a special resolution and take the time of this House in order to fund those needs.

So I am saying to the Members of the House that we have practiced austerity in its very essence. I have a list here of what the various standing and select committees have done to abide by the austerity program indicated by Gramm-Rudman. Here are some examples. The Judiciary Committee I mentioned for their \$50,000 had to go the circuitous route that they did through the special resolution. The Select Committee on Narcotics has requested a limited \$5,000, which I had to refuse them—\$5,000 in that very, very sensitive area. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has furloughed every employee in that committee for 5 days every month, and on and on. The Merchant Marine Committee has permanently terminated 10 employees, and the Committee on Aging will furlough most employees for 3 weeks coming up tentatively. HIS already has terminated 12 employees.

I conclude by very clumsily asking this group, look at the practicality of what this cut means.



Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Members of this body have listened to our two distinguished Members from Minnesota. I have been studying this process now I think in the last 3 weeks through several appropriations bills, and today I think that I hit on something.

I want to take the Members back to the debate on Gramm-Rudman. One Member of the body stood in the well and said rather graphically, and I remember the gestures, that Gramm-Rudman will change the way we do business in this body. I think that we need to be aware of that, because indeed the members of the Committee on Appropriations have indeed spoken, and spoken well, for how hard they have worked, and they have worked hard.

If you take a look at the budget process in this House, beginning with the President's budget, which is a budget for current services, we do have a current-services process where we indeed develop spending programs and budgets and appropriations bills by looking backward. As we look backward on what we have done in the past and how hard we have worked to hold spending down in light of our past, we do have a right to feel good about the work that we have done. And again I would commend the Appropriations Committees for doing so.

Yet they feel the frustration for those of us who continually seem to be out here saying that we must do more, and I think that Mr. FRENZEL has given us the reason. We are looking ahead. The fact is, and the Committee on the Budget will tell you, they know that when it comes time to face the music on Gramm-Rudman, we are going to be \$25 billion short. We are going to face the possibility of a \$25 billion sequestration. The best way in the world to minimize that pain and that heartburn at that time is to look into each and every one of these appropriation bills at this time and see where we can do more to cut spending now selectively, creatively, and responsibly, in order to avoid those very, very painful and in fact unnecessary across-the-board cuts later.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman talks about unnecessary expenses. He used the House gym as a hotel. Does he not think that was an abuse of taxpayers' money?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PANETTA). The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] has expired.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to point out, in opposition to the amendment, that this bill is both within the BA and the outlay numbers in the budget resolution. So much for the argument about the budget resolution and sequestration.

I would point out that this bill has been at a virtual freeze for 2 years. In contrast, the Office of Administration for the Executive Office of the President is up 13.7 percent; the executive residence of the White House is up 17.9 percent; and the Office of Management and Budget is up 15 percent. I do not think that the Congress has to apologize in comparison to the executive branch in our frugality.

I for one am tired of having administration witnesses come down to the Appropriations Committee having two rows of backup for every witness, and we may have two or three staff people at most in the appropriations process to try to give oversight that this country has a right to expect on the administrative branch of Government.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard some complaints about what we will do to our budgets and how we may destroy our efficiency around here. I think that it is fair to note that the accounts that we are talking about are all expanded in this particular bill by more than the cost of living. For instance somebody complained about CBO and GAO. CBO is up 7 percent; GAO is up 6 percent. My amendment will simply bring them down to a level which will take care of them, they will be getting an inflation allowance, but no more.

Committee employees, up 16 percent; the Committee on Appropriations itself, up 10 percent. I do not think that we need those very large increases. If we need them, perhaps we can forgo them for a 1-year period while we do our best to meet the Gramm-Rudman targets that we have set for ourselves.

This is a pretty simple amendment. I think that everybody understands it. It has all the infirmities of every across-the-board amendment. It is a bit of a blunt instrument, and many Members will not be for it for that reason.

It is the best vehicle that is available for me to try to put on a freeze at 1986 BA levels.

□ 1700

I believe with respect to congressional operations, there will still be plenty of money left to run our elevators and to do our staff work and to take care of our necessary expenses.

I believe the Congress should be the very first to inflict on itself a little sacrifice so that it could then, with a

clear conscience, vote for its reconciliation bills and vote for its sequester.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment will be passed.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This appropriation bill is within the 1987 budget. The budget is our guideline. Arbitrary picking of freeze amounts in 1986 does not do the job. What we have to live within are the outlays and the budget authority that are in the budget.

This appropriation does so, even if one factors in what the other body's outlays and budget authority are likely to be.

For that reason, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to my good friend, the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank my chairman for yielding and would like to close the debate by first mentioning the fact that throughout the process of developing this bill, we have had really fantastic bipartisan support as we have gone through the very difficult task of developing the appropriations measure that provides the funding for the necessary work of the Congress.

I would like to express my appreciation to my chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] for his work; to the gentleman from Minnesota, BILL FRENZEL, for the work that he has been involved in in attempting to provide some restraint in terms of Federal spending as it relates to the legislative branch.

This bill is a very, very effective tool that essentially says that the Congress is providing the leadership needed that will lead toward restraint in spending.

The bill is some \$350 million below the 302(b) amount in the budget, both in outlays and in authority. We are far below those projected figures.

It is very important for the membership to realize that as we all recognize, it is tough to vote for our own. In this case, we have done the job of cutting back the levels of expenditures requested.

I urge my members to swallow hard and vote for their own bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PANETTA). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

## [Roll No. 258]

Ackerman	Coughlin	Gradison
Akaka	Courter	Gray (IL)
Alexander	Coyne	Gray (PA)
Anderson	Craig	Green
Andrews	Crane	Gregg
Annunzio	Daniel	Guarini
Anthony	Dannemeyer	Hall (OH)
Applegate	Darden	Hall, Ralph
Archer	Daschle	Hamilton
Armey	Daub	Hammerschmidt
Aspin	Davis	Hansen
Atkins	de la Garza	Hatcher
AuCoin	DeLay	Hawkins
Badham	Dellums	Hayes
Bartlett	DeWine	Hefner
Barton	Dickinson	Hendon
Bateman	Dicks	Henry
Bates	Dingell	Hertel
Bedell	DioGuardi	Hiler
Beilenson	Dixon	Hillis
Bennett	Donnelly	Holt
Bentley	Dorgan (ND)	Hopkins
Bereuter	Dornan (CA)	Horton
Berman	Dowdy	Howard
Bevill	Downey	Hoyer
Biaggi	Dreier	Hubbard
Billakis	Duncan	Hughes
Billey	Durbin	Hunter
Boehlert	Dwyer	Hutto
Boggs	Dymally	Hyde
Boland	Dyson	Jacobs
Boner (TN)	Early	Jeffords
Bonior (MI)	Eckart (OH)	Jenkins
Bonker	Eckert (NY)	Johnson
Borski	Edwards (CA)	Jones (NC)
Bosco	Emerson	Jones (OK)
Boucher	English	Jones (TN)
Boulter	Erdreich	Kanjorski
Boxer	Evans (IA)	Kaptur
Brooks	Evans (IL)	Kasich
Broomfield	Fascell	Kastenmeier
Brown (CA)	Fawell	Kemp
Brown (CO)	Fazio	Kennelly
Bruce	Fiedler	Kildee
Bryant	Fields	Kindness
Burton (CA)	Fish	Klecza
Burton (IN)	Flippo	Kolbe
Bustamante	Florio	Kolter
Byron	Foglietta	Kostmayer
Callahan	Foley	Kramer
Carper	Ford (MI)	LaFalce
Carr	Ford (TN)	Lagomarsino
Chandler	Frank	Lantos
Chapman	Franklin	Latta
Chappell	Frenzel	Leach (IA)
Chapple	Fuqua	Lehman (CA)
Cheney	Gallo	Lehman (FL)
Clay	Garcia	Leland
Clinger	Gaydos	Lent
Coats	Gejdenson	Levin (MI)
Cobey	Gekas	Levine (CA)
Coble	Gephardt	Lewis (CA)
Coelho	Gibbons	Lewis (FL)
Coleman (MO)	Gilman	Lightfoot
Coleman (TX)	Gingrich	Lipinski
Combust	Glickman	Livingston
Conte	Gonzalez	Lloyd
Conyers	Goodling	Loeffler
Cooper	Gordon	Long

Lott	Panetta	Snowe
Lowery (CA)	Pashayan	Snyder
Lowry (WA)	Pease	Solarz
Lujan	Penny	Solomon
Luken	Pepper	Spence
Lundine	Perkins	Spratt
Lungren	Petri	St Germain
Mack	Pickie	Staggers
MacKay	Porter	Stallings
Madigan	Price	Stangeland
Manton	Pursell	Stokes
Markey	Quillen	Strang
Martin (IL)	Rangel	Stratton
Martin (NY)	Ray	Studds
Martinez	Regula	Stump
Matsui	Reid	Sundquist
Mavroules	Richardson	Sweeney
Mazzoli	Ridge	Swift
McCain	Rinaldo	Swindall
McCandless	Ritter	Synar
McCloskey	Roberts	Tallon
McCollum	Robinson	Tauke
McCurdy	Rodino	Tauzin
McDade	Roe	Taylor
McEwen	Rogers	Thomas (GA)
McGrath	Rose	Torres
McHugh	Rostenkowski	Torricelli
McKernan	Roth	Towns
McKinney	Roukema	Traficant
McMillan	Rowland (CT)	Traxler
Meyers	Rowland (GA)	Valentine
Mica	Roybal	Vander Jagt
Michel	Rudd	Vento
Mikulski	Russo	Visclosky
Miller (CA)	Sabo	Volkmer
Miller (OH)	Savage	Vucanovich
Miller (WA)	Saxton	Waldon
Mineta	Schaefer	Walgren
Mitchell	Schneider	Walker
Moakley	Schroeder	Watkins
Molinari	Schuetz	Waxman
Mollohan	Schulze	Weaver
Monson	Schumer	Weber
Montgomery	Seiberling	Weiss
Moody	Sensenbrenner	Wheat
Moorhead	Sharp	Whitehurst
Morrison (CT)	Shaw	Whitley
Morrison (WA)	Shelby	Whittaker
Mrazek	Shumway	Whitten
Murphy	Shuster	Williams
Murtha	Sikorski	Wilson
Myers	Siljander	Wirth
Natcher	Sisisky	Wise
Neal	Skeen	Wolf
Nelson	Skelton	Wolpe
Nichols	Slatery	Wortley
Nielson	Slaughter	Wright
Nowak	Smith (FL)	Wyden
Oakar	Smith (IA)	Wyllie
Oberstar	Smith (NE)	Yates
Obey	Smith (NJ)	Yatron
Olin	Smith, Denny	Young (AK)
Ortiz	(OR)	Young (FL)
Owens	Smith, Robert	Young (MO)
Oxley	(NH)	Zschau
Packard	Smith, Robert	(OR)

## □ 1720

The CHAIRMAN. Four hundred two Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL] for a recorded vote. Five minutes will be allowed for the vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 209, not voting 23, as follows:

## [Roll No. 259]

## AYES—199

Andrews	Barton	Bentley
Archer	Bateman	Bereuter
Armey	Bates	Bilakis
Badham	Bedell	Billey
Bartlett	Bennett	Boehlert

Boulter	Hopkins	Regula
Broomfield	Hubbard	Ridge
Brown (CO)	Huckaby	Rinaldo
Burton (IN)	Hunter	Ritter
Byron	Hutto	Roberts
Callahan	Hyde	Robinson
Carper	Jacobs	Rogers
Chandler	Jeffords	Roth
Chapple	Johnson	Roukema
Cheney	Jones (OK)	Rowland (CT)
Coats	Kanjorski	Saxton
Cobey	Kasich	Schaefer
Coble	Kemp	Schneider
Coleman (MO)	Kindness	Schuetz
Combust	Kolbe	Schulze
Cooper	Kramer	Sensenbrenner
Coughlin	Lagomarsino	Sharp
Courter	Latta	Shaw
Craig	Leach (IA)	Shumway
Crane	Lent	Shuster
Daniel	Lewis (FL)	Sikorski
Dannemeyer	Lightfoot	Siljander
Daschle	Lloyd	Slatery
Daub	Loeffler	Slaughter
Davis	Lott	Smith (NE)
DeLay	Lujan	Smith (NJ)
DeWine	Lungren	Smith, Denny
Dickinson	Mack	(OR)
DioGuardi	MacKay	Smith, Robert
Dornan (CA)	Madigan	(NH)
Dreier	Martin (IL)	Smith, Robert
Duncan	Martin (NY)	(OR)
Eckart (OH)	McCain	Snowe
Eckert (NY)	McCandless	Snyder
Edwards (OK)	McCloskey	Solomon
Emerson	McCollum	Spence
English	McCurdy	Stallings
Erdreich	McEwen	Stangeland
Evans (IA)	McGrath	Strang
Fawell	McKernan	Stratton
Fiedler	McMillan	Stump
Fields	Meyers	Sundquist
Fish	Michel	Sweeney
Franklin	Miller (OH)	Swindall
Frenzel	Miller (WA)	Tauke
Gallo	Molinari	Tauzin
Gekas	Monson	Taylor
Gibbons	Moorhead	Valentine
Gilman	Morrison (WA)	Vander Jagt
Gingrich	Nelson	Vucanovich
Glickman	Nichols	Walgren
Goodling	Nielson	Walker
Gradison	Olin	Weber
Gregg	Oxley	Whitehurst
Hall, Ralph	Packard	Whittaker
Hamilton	Pashayan	Wirth
Hammerschmidt	Penny	Wise
Hansen	Petri	Wortley
Hendon	Pickle	Wyllie
Henry	Porter	Young (FL)
Hiler	Pursell	Zschau
Hillis	Quillen	
Holt	Ray	

## NOES—209

Ackerman	Chappell	Foglietta
Akaka	Clay	Foley
Alexander	Clinger	Ford (MI)
Anderson	Coelho	Ford (TN)
Annunzio	Coleman (TX)	Frank
Anthony	Conte	Frost
Applegate	Conyers	Fuqua
Aspin	Coyne	Garcia
Atkins	Darden	Gaydos
AuCoin	de la Garza	Gejdenson
Beilenson	Dellums	Gephardt
Berman	Derrick	Gonzalez
Bevill	Dicks	Gordon
Biaggi	Dingell	Gray (IL)
Boggs	Dixon	Gray (PA)
Boland	Donnelly	Green
Boner (TN)	Dorgan (ND)	Guarini
Bonior (MI)	Dowdy	Hall (OH)
Borski	Downey	Hatcher
Bosco	Durbin	Hawkins
Boucher	Dwyer	Hayes
Boxer	Dymally	Hefner
Brooks	Dyson	Hertel
Brown (CA)	Early	Horton
Bruce	Edwards (CA)	Howard
Bryant	Evans (IL)	Hoyer
Burton (CA)	Fascell	Hughes
Bustamante	Fazio	Jenkins
Carr	Flippo	Jones (NC)
Chapman	Florio	Jones (TN)



Kaptur	Morrison (CT)	Smith (IA)
Kastenmeier	Mrazek	Solarz
Kennelly	Murphy	Spratt
Kildee	Murtha	St Germain
Kiecicka	Myers	Staggers
Kolter	Natcher	Stark
Kostmayer	Neal	Stokes
LaFalce	Nowak	Studds
Lantos	Oakar	Swift
Lehman (CA)	Oberstar	Synar
Lehman (FL)	Obey	Tallon
Leland	Ortiz	Thomas (GA)
Levin (MI)	Owens	Torres
Levine (CA)	Panetta	Torricelli
Lewis (CA)	Pease	Towns
Lipinski	Pepper	Traffant
Livingston	Perkins	Traxler
Long	Price	Udall
Lowery (CA)	Rangel	Vento
Lowry (WA)	Reid	Visclosky
Luken	Richardson	Volkmer
Lundine	Rodino	Waldon
Manton	Roe	Watkins
Markey	Rose	Waxman
Martinez	Rostenkowski	Weaver
Matsui	Rowland (GA)	Weiss
Mavroules	Roybal	Wheat
Mazzoli	Rudd	Whitley
McDade	Russo	Whitten
McHugh	Sabo	Williams
McKinney	Savage	Wilson
Mica	Scheuer	Wolf
Mikulski	Schroeder	Wolpe
Miller (CA)	Schumer	Wright
Mineta	Seiberling	Wyden
Mitchell	Shelby	Yates
Moakley	Sisisky	Yatron
Mollohan	Skeen	Young (AK)
Montgomery	Skelton	Young (MO)
Moody	Smith (FL)	

## NOT VOTING—23

Barnard	Edgar	Marlenee
Barnes	Feighan	Moore
Bonker	Fowler	Parris
Breaux	Grothberg	Rahall
Campbell	Gunderson	Roemer
Carney	Hartnett	Stenholm
Collins	Ireland	Thomas (CA)
Crockett	Leath (TX)	

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Campbell for, with Mr. Barnard against.

Mr. DERRICK changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## TWENTY-FIFTH ANNUAL BALL GAME BETWEEN DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS

By unanimous consent (Mr. CONTE was allowed to proceed out of order.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, tonight, once again, this Congress will witness the great battle between the Democrats and Republicans on the ball diamond. This year, our 25th annual game, will be held at Four-Mile Run Baseball Park in Alexandria at 6:30. The proceeds for the game will go to Children's Hospital.

But, Mr. Chairman something has been affecting your party's team. Over the past 3 years, the Democrats—y younger, swifter, more talented—at least according to MARTY RUSSO, who thinks he is 25 years old, but throws like he was 100, have not been able to win.

So I have a suggestion for your manager, the wily Mr. CHAPPELL—take samples. That's right—just like Pete Rozelle in the NFL, you should be

taking samples to determine what substances are affecting your team. I want you to know that I have tested the entire Republican team and with the exception of trace or two of premium draft, they came clean.

But with your team, such a test could make a difference. I'm told that with these samples they can even determine the effect on your players of those 25 cent cigars that SABO and CHAPPELL smoke. Considering the brands they buy, it's a wonder anyone on your team can see much less hit.

These samples can also tell you the effect of sugar on MARTY RUSSO. The way that guy puts away pizza, milkshakes, and Cokes, it could be affecting his throws. The ball simply sticks to his hand.

In fact, I have heard that such a sampling effort can determine the effect of Gramm-Rudman on MIKE SYNAR. That would really be interesting to know.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge you to follow my team's lead. It may be the key to success. With spaced-out players like BILL NELSON on your team, CHAPPELL is going to have a real challenge in bringing your team back to the reality that defeat once again looms at the hand of the mighty elephant Republican team.

## UPDATE ON THE 25TH ANNUAL BALL GAME

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DOWNEY of New York was allowed to proceed out of order.)

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, the House Democratic team is prepared to stand tall and take the test that Mr. CONTE offers, and we, like the American League this year in the All-Star Game, intend to reverse the awful trend of the last 3 years.

It is quite clear to me that the Republican team will have far better use for these plans after we are finished with them than we will for urine samples prior to the game.

You will watch the inimitable donkeys fight their way to victory, and I predict a 7-to-5 victory on our part tonight.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GEPHARDT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5203) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 266, noes 146, not voting 19, as follows:

## [Roll No. 260]

## AYES—266

Ackerman	Dymally	Lent
Akaka	Dyson	Levin (MI)
Alexander	Early	Levine (CA)
Anderson	Eckart (OH)	Lewis (CA)
Andrews	Edwards (CA)	Lipinski
Annuzio	Edwards (OK)	Livingston
Anthony	English	Lloyd
Applegate	Evans (IL)	Loeffler
Atkins	Fascell	Long
AuCoin	Fazio	Lowery (CA)
Bateman	Fish	Lowry (WA)
Bates	Flippo	Luken
Bedell	Florio	Lundine
Beilenson	Foglietta	MacKay
Bennett	Foley	Madigan
Bentley	Ford (MI)	Manton
Berman	Ford (TN)	Markey
Bevill	Frank	Martin (NY)
Biaggi	Franklin	Martinez
Bliley	Frost	Matsui
Boggs	Fuqua	Mavroules
Boland	Garcia	Mazzoli
Boner (TN)	Gaydos	McCloskey
Bonior (MI)	Gejdenson	McCurdy
Bonker	Gephardt	McDade
Borski	Gibbons	McGrath
Bosco	Gilman	McHugh
Boucher	Gonzalez	McKinney
Boxer	Gordon	Mica
Brooks	Gray (IL)	Michel
Brown (CA)	Gray (PA)	Mikulski
Bruce	Green	Miller (CA)
Bryant	Guarini	Mineta
Burton (CA)	Hall (OH)	Mitchell
Bustamante	Hamilton	Moakley
Byron	Hatcher	Mollinari
Callahan	Hawkins	Mollohan
Carper	Hayes	Montgomery
Carr	Hefner	Moody
Chapman	Hertel	Morrison (CT)
Chappell	Hillis	Mrazek
Clay	Holt	Murphy
Coelho	Horton	Murtha
Coleman (TX)	Howard	Myers
Conte	Hoyer	Natcher
Conyers	Huckaby	Neal
Cooper	Hutto	Nelson
Coughlin	Jeffords	Nichols
Coyne	Jenkins	Nowak
Daniel	Jones (NC)	Oakar
Darden	Jones (TN)	Oberstar
Daschle	Kanjorski	Obey
Davis	Kaptur	Ortiz
de la Garza	Kastenmeier	Owens
Dellums	Kennelly	Panetta
Derrick	Kildee	Pease
Dickinson	Kiecicka	Pepper
Dicks	Kolter	Perkins
Dixon	Kostmayer	Porter
Donnelly	LaFalce	Price
Dowdy	Lantos	Quillen
Downey	Leath (TX)	Rangel
Duncan	Lehman (CA)	Reid
Durbin	Lehman (FL)	Richardson
Dwyer	Leland	Rodino

Roe	Solarz	Volkmer
Rogers	Spratt	Walden
Rose	St Germain	Walgren
Rostenkowski	Staggers	Watkins
Rowland (GA)	Stallings	Waxman
Roybal	Stark	Weaver
Rudd	Stokes	Weiss
Russo	Stratton	Wheat
Sabo	Studds	Whitehurst
Savage	Swift	Whitley
Scheuer	Synar	Whitten
Schneider	Tallon	Williams
Schroeder	Tauzin	Wilson
Schumer	Thomas (GA)	Wise
Seiberling	Torres	Wolf
Shelby	Torricelli	Wolpe
Sikorski	Towns	Wortley
Sisisky	Trafficant	Wright
Skeen	Traxler	Yates
Skelton	Udall	Yatron
Smith (FL)	Valentine	Young (AK)
Smith (IA)	Vander Jagt	Young (FL)
Smith (NJ)	Vento	Young (MO)
Snowe	Visclosky	

## NOES—146

Archer	Hendon	Ridge
Armey	Henry	Rinaldo
Badham	Hiler	Ritter
Bartlett	Hopkins	Roberts
Barton	Hubbard	Robinson
Bereuter	Hughes	Roemer
Billirakis	Hunter	Roth
Boehlert	Hyde	Roukema
Boulter	Ireland	Rowland (CT)
Broomfield	Jacobs	Saxton
Brown (CO)	Johnson	Schaefer
Burton (IN)	Jones (OK)	Schuetz
Chandler	Kasich	Schulze
Chappie	Kemp	Sensenbrenner
Cheney	Kindness	Sharp
Clinger	Kolbe	Shaw
Coats	Kramer	Shumway
Cobey	Lagomarsino	Shuster
Coble	Latta	Siljander
Coleman (MO)	Leach (IA)	Slatery
Combest	Lewis (FL)	Slaughter
Courter	Lightfoot	Smith (NE)
Craig	Lott	Smith, Denny
Crane	Lujan	(OR)
Dannemeyer	Lungren	Smith, Robert
Daub	Mack	(NH)
DeLay	Martin (IL)	Smith, Robert
DeWine	McCain	(OR)
DioGuardi	McCandless	Snyder
Dorgan (ND)	McCollum	Solomon
Dornan (CA)	McEwen	Spence
Dreier	McKernan	Stangeland
Eckert (NY)	McMillan	Stenholm
Emerson	Meyers	Strang
Erdreich	Miller (OH)	Stump
Evans (IA)	Miller (WA)	Sundquist
Fawell	Monson	Sweeney
Fiedler	Moorhead	Swindall
Fields	Morrison (WA)	Tauke
Frenzel	Nielson	Taylor
Gallo	Olin	Thomas (CA)
Gekas	Oxley	Vucanovich
Gingrich	Packard	Walker
Glickman	Pashayan	Weber
Goodling	Penny	Whittaker
Gradison	Petri	Wirth
Gregg	Pickle	Wyden
Hall, Ralph	Pursell	Wyllie
Hammerschmidt	Ray	Zschau
Hansen	Regula	

## NOT VOTING—19

Aspin	Crockett	Hartnett
Barnard	Dingell	Marlenee
Barnes	Edgar	Moore
Breaux	Feighan	Parris
Campbell	Fowler	Rahall
Carney	Groberg	
Collins	Gunderson	

□ 1745

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Barnard for, with Mr. Campbell against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the vote on rollcall No. 256 I was away from the Hill and missed the vote. Had I been here, I would have voted "no."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WALDON. Mr. Speaker, I was with people from my district when rollcall No. 256 was acted upon by the House. I would like to have the record show that had I been here, I would have voted in the negative.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to state that he will entertain 1-minute speeches now, and after the 1-minute the House will proceed with general debate on the transportation bill, if there is no objection. If a Member questions going into the Committee of the Whole, then the House would have completed its business. Members understand that Members who have left for the day should be protected.

## A PROPOSED IMPORT FEE ON FOREIGN OIL

(Mr. JONES of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, today we are circulating a letter to the President pleading with him to use the authority he has under the existing Trade Act to impose an import fee on foreign oil and oil products.

This is a matter of national security. In the oil patch the independent domestic oil industry is literally being driven out of business by a deliberate policy of OPEC nations to drive down producer prices and to drive domestic U.S. producers out of the business. We are already trending in the direction of the late 1960's and early 1970's in which the United States is depending more and more on foreign sources and specifically OPEC sources for our energy needs.

The only thing that can change this and stabilize the domestic oil industry is to put an import fee on foreign oil to equalize the tax foreign producers would pay equal to that of domestic producers. The President has this authority, and we are asking him to use this authority. Such authority in the form of an import fee would not help big oil companies, but it is absolutely vital to independent producers and to

oil patch States such as Oklahoma to keep this depression in the oil patch from continuing.

Mr. Speaker, we hope the President will listen to our plea, and I hope my colleagues will join in signing this letter to him.

## PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO SIT ON TOMORROW DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit while the House is reading for amendment under the 5-minute rule on tomorrow, July 30, 1986. This request has been cleared by the minority.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

## COMMENDATIONS FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL AND ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY EMPLOYEES

(Mr. MARTIN of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my personal congratulations and recognition from the Congress to employees of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the U.S. Border Patrol, the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, and New York State Police personnel in northern New York for their handling of what could have been a sensitive international incident earlier this summer.

At 10:42 p.m. on June 25, a 27-year-old Cuban seaman, carrying only an English-Spanish dictionary and a few personal belongings, jumped from the deck of his Cuban vessel as it was transiting the St. Lawrence Seaway's Eisenhower lock in Massena, NY. The seaman's intention was to seek political asylum in the United States.

The matter was handled quickly and efficiently with only 15 minutes passing between the time he jumped ship until he departed Eisenhower lock in the custody of American officials.

The Seaway Corporation employees, following that agency's well-thought-out and written procedures addressing such circumstances, apprehended and detained the Cuban national until Immigration personnel arrived. Recognizing that he might be seeking political asylum, they made no attempt to force him back onto the ship. Hundreds of foreign-flag vessels transit the Seaway locks at Massena every year, and because many of them are from Soviet bloc nations, the Corporation's person-



nel are always mindful of the fact that such occurrences could happen, although this is the first such incident in recent years.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, ships from Communist nations are free to transit the 2,300-mile long Seaway, an international waterway jointly administered by our country and Canada. The Seaway Corporation is an operating administration of our U.S. Department of Transportation and is ably headed by Administrator James Emery.

Specifically, I want to recognize the activities of Seaway employees, Cheri Ritzmann and Sharon Roraback, and the members of the Eisenhower lock crew who were on duty at the time, Calvin Kinney, Jack Jorgenson, Roger Premo, Toban Corey, and James Hitsman. All of them handled this incident in a most professional manner.

In conversations with my colleagues over the years, Mr. Speaker, I have frequently cited the Seaway Corporation as a unique Federal agency. With less than 200 employees, it is one of the smallest of our agencies, but its employees have consistently shown us that it is one of which we can be very proud. Its employees work on a day-to-day basis with seamen from all around the world. Not only are they dedicated to their special crafts, they are on the front line as ambassadors of good will, as well. I am very proud of them and am pleased to cite their performances to my colleagues in the Congress.

□ 1755

#### INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO COMPEL LTV CORP. TO CONTINUE PAYING INSURANCE BENEFITS TO RETIREES

(Mr. STOKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation along with 22 cosponsors that will compel LTV Corp., which has filed for protection from its creditors under chapter 11, to continue paying medical and life insurance benefits to its retirees until a bankruptcy court orders the cessation of such benefits.

LTV's decision to cancel health and life insurance benefits would affect 78,500 retirees and their families, including 30,000 in the Cleveland area alone. This action on the part of LTV demonstrates a callous disregard for the welfare of employees who have loyally served that company and labored to make LTV our Nation's second largest domestic steel manufacturer.

Mr. Speaker, this action on the part of LTV has potentially disastrous ramifications for retirees living on a fixed income and dependent on these benefits. Already, I have received re-

ports of incidents whereby LTV retirees have been denied medical treatment due to the lack of insurance coverage. The fact that some of our Nation's senior citizens have been turned away from hospitals and other health care facilities is not only appalling but represents a total abandonment of LTV's responsibility to its former employees.

Yesterday, in hearings held in Cleveland, Prof. Vern Countryman of Harvard, America's foremost bankruptcy expert, testified in favor of the legislation which I have today introduced in the House. Professor Countryman stated unequivocally that the action of LTV Steel in canceling retirees' health and life insurance benefits was in violation of the law.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in the cosponsorship of this legislation.

#### FATHER JENCO AND GEORGE O'BRIEN

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, My home State of Illinois and the Nation recently suffered a great loss when our colleague, George O'Brien, died.

Among his many fine achievements, none was closer to George's heart than his unceasing efforts to secure the release of Father Lawrence Jenco, who is a native of Joliet, IL, in George's district.

So we greet the release of Father Jenco from his captivity with a mixture of joy and sorrow—joy that he has been returned to his family and loved ones, but sorrow that George, who had worked so long for this day, was not here to greet Father Jenco.

Last year, George came to my office with members of Father Jenco's family. He told me—as they did—of their great faith that Father Jenco would emerge from his captivity, but also of their understandable discontent over the slow and seemingly fruitless diplomatic process.

I was deeply moved by their message.

George went beyond the call of duty in this case. He journeyed to Syria to talk to officials in the hopes of gaining Father Jenco's release.

I believe that George O'Brien's persistence, his faith, his unswerving devotion to the cause of Father Jenco contributed not only to the morale of Father Jenco's family, but to the ultimate happy outcome.

I just want to say that George O'Brien's work on behalf of the Jenco family, and especially Father Jenco, was certainly one of George's finest hours.

#### FATHER JENCO AND GEORGE O'BRIEN

(Mr. DORNAN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, it was at George O'Brien's inspiration, because his health was failing, that I went ahead to Syria 1 month ago on a trip that we had planned to take together, to deliver a letter signed by 251 of our colleagues, asking the nation of Syria, and particularly its President, Mr. Assad, to do what he could to get the release of our hostages.

George was with me in spirit on that trip. He told me, from his wheelchair in the corner of the House floor just 17 days before he died, to tell President Assad that he thought Mr. Assad was sincere in his efforts to help and to please do what he could to speed this process up.

I passed those words on to President Assad just 4 days later. I told him that George O'Brien's health was failing and that George would appreciate it if he would redouble his efforts.

Now I want to express my gratitude to President Assad and the Syrian Government, because he told me that day, June 30, that we would have very good news very soon. Then he expressed himself on something that I urged him to do and that was to let the hostages communicate so that there would not be a double trauma—the psychological torture of the brothers, the families, the mothers, the wives, and the children. As we now know, President Assad kept this promise to me. The American people are grateful to know that our remaining three hostages are alive. But we are still worried for their safety and anxious for their return.

I am now going to ask the 181 Members who I could not get to in time to sign my original letter to President Assad to sign another letter expressing gratitude to President Assad for the release of Father Jenco and to ask him to get out our other three brave men.

I have a resolution I have submitted today to that effect.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN TEXTILE AGREEMENT

(Mr. DERRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, it disgusts me to learn that Americans can continue to buy clothing made in South Africa. By doing so, we're wrapping ourselves in the misery of that country's black majority. It appalls me, as a textile State representative, to learn that South African textile imports will be allowed to increase 4 per-

cent. And that's on top of what they are already dumping on our retail stores! The administration's textile negotiators are giving the oppressive Government of South Africa even more leeway than they have given to exporters such as Taiwan and Hong Kong.

It's bad enough that we're allowing the flood of textile imports to continue robbing Americans of their jobs. But when we allow a nation such as South Africa to do it, that's downright idiotic!

#### **PRESIDENT SHOULD IMPOSE VARIABLE RATE OIL IMPORT FEE**

(Mr. TAUZIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, in signing a letter to the President asking him to use the authority that he currently enjoys to impose a variable rate oil import fee before things get much worse in this country.

In Louisiana today, the unemployment rate struck a high of 13.6 percent. In my own hometown of Thibodaux, LA, the rate is 18-plus percent.

The workers in Thibodaux, LA, and throughout Louisiana who have lost their jobs have lost those jobs as surely to the flood of oil imports as have the workers from the automobile plants and steel mills of America. Those Americans in Louisiana have unfortunately been denied trade adjustment assistance, and yet nevertheless they are out of work as surely as other workers have been put out of work by imports.

The national security implications of this tide of imports is serious, too. We learned last week that the U.S. dependence on Persian Gulf oil has increased threefold in the last year, 300 percent, and that dependence on foreign oil continues to grow as Americans are put out of work in numbers that would surprise and shock you in the gulf patch of Louisiana and throughout the Southwest.

Mr. President, we call upon you, use your authority, impose an oil import fee now and protect this country and the jobs of America. We need your help.

#### **FATHER JENCO AND GEORGE O'BRIEN**

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], and the distinguished

gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] in praising the efforts of our belated Member, George O'Brien, for his efforts in attempting to secure the release of the American hostages that are presently being held and for his efforts, particularly with regard to Father Jenco, the Catholic priest who was just released.

George had his heart in this effort and discussed this with many of us, particularly with those of us on the task force on the Foreign Affairs Committee who have been trying to find a way to try to release the hostages.

George's efforts motivated many of us to try to find additional avenues.

I am pleased to have joined with the gentleman from California in his effort in making an appeal to the Syrian head of Government, President Assad. We hope in our future efforts that we will finally and eventually see George O'Brien's wish fulfilled that all the American hostages will eventually be free.

I know all my colleagues join in that prayer and in that wish.

#### **FATHER JENCO AND GEORGE O'BRIEN**

(Mr. MINETA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, the Rev. Lawrence M. Jenco has been released from his captivity in Lebanon, and has been reunited with his family. I know all the Members of this House join with me in sending the Jencos our best wishes.

As I am sure Father Jenco knows, no man could have a more loyal and hard-working family than he has. During the 18 months he was held prisoner, Father Jenco's family tirelessly crusaded for his release. All of us who have worked with the hostage families are filled with admiration for their strength and unwavering determination.

As several of the hostage families have said, the administration has been shamefully slow in recognizing their ordeal. I am convinced that pressure from this Congress played a major role in Father Jenco's release, as it also did in Rev. Ben Weir's release earlier.

If we are to see the other American hostages, then I believe we in the Congress must maintain our support for the families and our pressure on the administration to find a solution to this all too long hostage drama.

I would also like to note with sadness that the late George M. O'Brien was a personal friend of Father Jenco, and spoke many times from this well on his behalf. I am sorry George is not with us now to share this moment.

#### **A MESSAGE FOR ROMANIA**

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, earlier today this Congress, this body, sent a message to our State Department and sent a message to the Romanian Government that 190 Members of this body, Republicans and Democrats, will no longer put up with the persecution of the Catholic Church, the Orthodox Church, the Baptist Church and the Pentecostals in the country of Romania. They are violating human rights.

There are many Members who after this vote said that if they had this at a different time they might have switched their votes.

They should know that the next time this issue comes up we are going to win, unless they change.

Congressman HALL of Ohio, Congressman SMITH of New Jersey and myself have a piece of legislation which will suspend the most-favored-nation status now held by Romania for 6 months.

We say to the Romanian Government, loosen up. Lighten up. Allow human rights to take place and be respected in Romania. If you do that, you will keep most-favored-nation status. If you do not do that, the 190 today who joined and others will be with us the next time to vote to knock out most-favored-nation status for the country of Romania.

#### **SOCIAL SECURITY COLA**

(Mr. WEISS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, when inflation goes up, Social Security recipients deserve a cost-of-living adjustment [COLA]. But under current law, they will only receive a COLA if inflation is more than a 3-percent trigger level.

The 3-percent trigger is unfair to our Nation's Social Security recipients, who are denied full protection against inflation. Even worse, the trigger has been the source of endless political posturing by the President and others, who have sought to temporarily eliminate the trigger requirement shortly before key elections.

In February 1985, I introduced legislation to reduce the 3-percent trigger to 1 percent in order to afford senior citizens with permanent inflation protection and remove the Social Security COLA from political considerations. I was joined in this effort by Representatives ROYBAL, TRAXLER, and 47 others.

I am pleased to note that last week, the Ways and Means Committee approved a provision that will accomplish what we set out to do. It will



guarantee a Social Security COLA to all beneficiaries, regardless of the rate of inflation.

If it is good policy to eliminate the trigger in election years, it should be good policy every year. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this new protection for Social Security recipients.

#### AN EXPRESSION OF OUTRAGE OVER TEXTILE AGREEMENT WITH SOUTH AFRICA

(Mr. HEFNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I am outraged to learn of the agreement this administration has reached with South Africa to allow them to increase their textile imports into the United States by 4 percent.

The administration secretly negotiated this agreement for an increase that is greater than the increase granted to Taiwan, South Korea, and Hong Kong, the major textile importers whose goods are flooding our markets and causing the loss of thousands of textile jobs in our country.

Congress has passed a textile import limitation measure which the President vetoed with the promise that better positions would be negotiated in the MFA and in bilateral agreements with our trading partners. But the agreements we see coming out of this administration—with Hong Kong, Taiwan, South Korea, and now South Africa—are calculated to further erode our domestic industry and put American workers out of jobs.

Now here we are saying to a country whose government supports apartheid and at a time when Congress is considering legislation to place sanctions against that country, that not only can they continue to import goods to the United States but they can increase imports in an area where a domestic industry has been seriously hurt by imports.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this action is wrong and that it is more important than ever that Congress override the President's veto of the textile bill.

□ 1810

#### THE ADMINISTRATION MUST TURN SOUTH AFRICAN TEX- TILE POLICY AROUND

(Mr. ATKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Speaker, there was once a football player who ran 90 yards into the wrong end zone. Football fans couldn't believe it.

Today we learned that the Reagan administration wants to increase imports of South African textiles. Those

who oppose apartheid and support the U.S. textile industry can't believe it.

Last month, this House voted total U.S. disinvestment in apartheid. Pretoria's crackdown on democracy was in full force. The international outcry for tough new sanctions was deafening.

And the oblivious U.S. textile trade negotiators were practicing "destructive disengagement" from this country's ideals.

One U.S. trade official, trying to keep his head in the sand, defended the deal "solely in textile terms, not broader political terms." But in textile terms, this deal stinks.

The textiles we import from South Africa keep 10,000 Americans out of work. In 1985, we imported 98 million square yards of cloth from South Africa, more than double the amount in the year before. This agreement allows Pretoria to increase its share of the U.S. textile market eight times more than any other bilateral deal we've signed this year.

A teammate of that football player chased him down the field, trying to get him to turn around, but it was too late.

It's not yet too late for the President to turn his trade team around. If he doesn't then he will by his deeds signal clear support for the apartheid regime of P.W. Botha and a willingness to pay for that support with American jobs.

#### GEORGE O'BRIEN'S TIRELESS EFFORTS TO WIN FATHER JENCO'S RELEASE

(Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, despite his time-consuming duties and deteriorating health in the last month, the efforts of our colleague, George O'Brien, to secure the release of Father Jenco set the standard for personal commitment by a Member of this body. From almost the beginning of Father Jenco's captivity, George O'Brien worked tirelessly to win his liberation. He provided instruction, aid, and assistance to the entire Jenco family in their own 25 trips to Washington.

The first Member of Congress to go to Syria on Father Jenco's behalf, he met not only with President Assad and other Syrian officials, but with representatives of the Vatican, France, Britain, Israel, Iran, Turkey, Egypt, and the United Nations.

His efforts opened up communications channels with the highest levels of the Syrian Government.

Here George continuously acted to coordinate the efforts of the State Department, White House, NSC, CIA, and the Congress. His own 1-minute almost every day that the House was in session from mid-June to December

ensured that the cause of Father Jenco would not be forgotten.

One of the members of the Jenco family said that George O'Brien at his death had gone to Heaven and found a special key to release Father Jenco. I think that we all agree, and we are very glad that the door was open.

#### PRESIDENT CAN RELIEVE OIL- PATCH MISERY

(Mr. WATKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleague from Oklahoma, JIM JONES, in a letter to the President of the United States, asking him to use the authority that he has at his fingertips with the stroke of the pen to be able through an executive order add an oil-import fee which would offer tremendous relief and preserve an industry in the U.S. oil patch.

Mr. Speaker, the President has that authority. We have endured pain in Oklahoma through unemployment. We have lost the greatest number of jobs ever in the history of our State, the greatest number of bankruptcies, and the greatest number of bank failures. Yet the President has such power that, with the stroke of the pen, he could relieve all this by putting on an oil-import fee and being able to allow the oil patch to survive.

Just 18 months ago we had 4,500 oil rigs drilling oil in the United States. Today we have approximately 650, the lowest number since 1930 or since we have been keeping records. That has been the disastrous policy of this administration, and this administration could do something about it if they only wanted to.

That is what I want the people in Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, and throughout this Nation to know, that the suffering, the destroying of families, could be prevented if the President just had the desire and will to correct it.

#### LTV POLICY TOWARD RETIREES IS WRONG

(Mr. VISCLOSKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and other of my colleagues in sponsoring legislation to require the LTV Corp. to resume providing health and life insurance coverage for company retirees, unless and until a court of competent jurisdiction orders them to cease.

On July 17 LTV Corp. filed for protection under chapter 11 bankruptcy proceedings and coldly chose not to

protect their 78,500 retirees; 4,832 of these retirees live in my district. I believe corporate management is wrong on the law, wrong in their management practices, and wrong in terms of meeting their responsibility to deal justly with those who continue to work at LTV facilities and those who have retired after faithfully contributing to the company's past success.

LTV is wrong on the law. Yesterday in testimony, Professor Countryman indicated his belief that the company is obligated to continue these payments until the company has negotiated changes with the union, or, failing that, has obtained a bankruptcy court order. Others have essentially suggested a similar position to this speaker.

LTV is wrong in terms of management practice. At a time when management should be working to bring all workers, regardless of the color of their collar together, they have pitted retirees against those in current service. They have pitted current employees at different facilities against one another. They have placed LTV union members in a position wherein they must assume the responsibility for all steel workers at other companies; companies who might be inclined to follow suit should a pattern be set.

LTV is wrong in terms of its obligation to create a just economic system. They should look more closely into the eyes of an Indiana Harbor Works employee with six children and a father who is an LTV retiree. A gentleman who last Friday had to decide whether or not to strike. I saw those eyes.

In sum, LTV corporate policy in terms of its suspension of health and life insurance benefits to its retirees is cold; it is wrong.

I trust that the action we have taken today will promptly lead to a correction of its action.

#### THE PRESIDENT SHOULD EXERCISE AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE IMPORT FEE

(Mrs. BOGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, falling oil prices are having a wrenching effect on the national economy. Petroleum-related employment is down well over 100,000 jobs. The number of active drilling rigs is at its lowest level since World War II.

Falling oil prices are worsening the trade balance rather than improving it because we are consuming more than in the past. In 1977 imports supplied 47 percent of all U.S. petroleum. Last year our reliance on foreign imports fell to 27 percent, yet today imports are up to 31 percent of consumption and CRS is projecting this level of consumption will rise to 50 percent by

1988. Virtually all of the increased U.S. oil imports come from OPEC countries.

The crises in American energy production:

Has caused economic hardship and unemployment in my region;

Has caused us to halt investment in finding new sources of domestic energy to replace what we are consuming today; and

Has caused increased foreign consumption which aggravates our trade balance and causes greater reliance on vulnerable energy resources from the Middle East.

President Reagan has existing Executive authority to impose import fees on strategic commodities, such as petroleum. I respectfully call on the President to exercise that authority immediately.

#### GRAMM-RUDMAN SUPPORTERS IGNORE CONSTITUTION, ECONOMIC REALITY

(Mr. FRANK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, you have to admire the determination of the supporters of Gramm-Rudman. In the first place, they have shown a marvelous ability not to let something as trifling as the Constitution of the United States interfere with their determination to have their way. Now they have a new obstacle that they are willing to brush aside—the American economy.

Today Paul Volcker told the Banking Committee that because of the failure of the economy to grow at the pace projected by the administration, the \$144 billion deficit target for the next fiscal year by Gramm-Rudman is beyond our reach.

Maybe our reach ought to exceed our grasp, but our legislation ought not to exceed our brainpower, and I am afraid that that is what happened with Gramm-Rudman. They tried in December of 1985 to predict what the economy was going to look like over the next few years; they were wrong.

Paul Volcker, not heretofore identified with the big-spending faction of the Government, tells us now that because the economy is not performing as was expected and as assumed by Gramm-Rudman, it does not make sense to push for the \$144 billion. But just as unconstitutionality did not get in the way of the Gramm-Rudman advocates, economic reality probably will not, either.

□ 1820

I hope the majority of this House will understand that what Mr. Volcker says is accurate and that we cannot, by legislative fiat, undo economic facts.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 5205, and that I may be permitted to include tables, charts and other extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OWENS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? There was no objection.

#### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1987

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5205) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1821

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5205, with Mr. PANETTA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we submit for your consideration and for the consideration of the Committee of the Whole the bill, H.R. 5205, making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for fiscal year 1987.



This is a good, responsible, balanced, well-crafted bill.

Before I get into the details of this particular bill, I first want to express my appreciation to the Members who serve on the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MRAZEK], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] all provided insight and perspective during the 3-month indepth review we gave to Federal transportation programs and policies during our hearing process. The subcommittee minority members have been equally diligent. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], all are to be commended for the spirit of cooperation they have displayed and the commitment they have shown to developing a safe and effective transportation system for this Nation. I want to mention the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and my special friend [Mr. COUGHLIN], who has spent long hours in committee hearings and has such a broad knowledge of our transportation programs and policies. I pay tribute to his knowledge, dedication, and character, and I want him to know of my great appreciation for his sound judgment and cooperation. Mr. COUGHLIN has enabled us to work as a team, rather than on a partisan basis. And I think that has been to the benefit of this country.

Mr. Chairman, in preparation for this bill the committee developed a hearing record contained in seven volumes amounting to over 6,000 pages. Testimony was received from more than 225 witnesses including 29 Members of this body.

This was done, I think, by having such a capable staff. I have been in the private sector and in the nonprofit sector and we are running a \$10 billion business on this subcommittee. We have done it with two staff members and two support staff. I want to commend Tom Kingfield, Greg Dahlberg, Linda Muir, and Janet Oakley. I also want to mention our other key staff members, Ken Kraft, associate staff with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. COUGHLIN, Jeff Jacobs, minority staff with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. CONTE, and Lucy Hand of my own staff.

The committee, I believe, has carefully reviewed the programs of the Department of Transportation and related agencies, and is recommending what we consider to be sufficient funds in light of current budgetary constraints to enable these agencies to help meet the requirements of our Nation's transportation system.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before you provides for total spending on Federal transportation programs of \$25.765 billion—of which \$10.285 billion is new budget authority and \$15.48 billion is comprised of various limitations on contract authority obligations.

In addition, the bill appropriates \$14.953 billion to liquidate contract authorizations.

Mr. Chairman, in terms of new budget authority, the bill is \$318.7 million, or 3 percent below the amount provided for similar activities in fiscal year 1986. The amount provided in fiscal year 1986 includes one-time appropriations made to the Coast Guard in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act 1986.

I think the Members would also be interested to know that the bill as reported by the full Appropriations Committee is about \$17 million under our section 302(b) allocation for budget authority. With regard to just discretionary authority, we are only \$99,000 below our section 302(b) allocation. As the Members know, under the Budget Act, the Budget Committee provides a lump sum allocation to the Appropriations Committee pursuant to section 302(a), and the Appropriations Committee then subdivides that among its 13 subcommittees. Our target for discretionary budget authority that was provided to us by the Committee on Appropriations is \$9.9 billion and we are within that amount.

With respect to the major recommendations in this bill, I would call the attention of the Members to pages 2 and 3 of the report. The major bill highlights are as follows:

First, the appropriation of \$2.797 billion for operations of the Federal Aviation Administration, \$32.58 million more than the budget request;

Second, a provision providing for obligations of not to exceed \$13.125 billion for Federal-aid highways, the same as the fiscal year 1986 level;

Third, the appropriation of \$1.85 billion for operating expenses of the Coast Guard;

Fourth, a continuation of funding for the existing urban mass transportation formula grant program at a level of \$2 billion;

Fifth, a total of \$613 million, including funds derived by transfer, for grants to Amtrak;

Sixth, a provision providing for obligations of not to exceed \$1.017 billion for airport development and planning grants;

Seventh, an appropriation of \$50 million for capital improvements at the metropolitan Washington airports;

Eighth, a total of \$829.914 million, including funds derived by transfer, for facilities and equipment of the Federal Aviation Administration;

Ninth, a provision providing for obligations of not to exceed \$1.015 billion for the discretionary grants program

of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration;

Tenth, the appropriation of \$200 million for transit projects substituted for interstate highway segments;

Eleventh, the appropriation of \$141.7 million for the research, engineering, and development activities of the Federal Aviation Administration;

Twelfth, a continuation of funding for the construction of the Washington metro system at the fiscal year 1986 level of \$217.239 million;

Thirteenth, a general provision providing that the air traffic controllers who were fired as a result of the 1981 strike shall not, as a class, be barred from reemployment as air traffic controllers; and

Fourteenth, a general provision prohibiting the takeoff and landing of any aircraft by a foreign air carrier owned directly or indirectly by the Government of South Africa or by South African nationals.

Mr. Chairman, for the Office of the Secretary of Transportation, the bill provides a total of \$73.443 million—a reduction of \$5.796 million from the current level and \$16.903 million above the budget. The bulk of the increase above the budget is for continuation of essential air service subsidies, which the administration proposed to eliminate. In addition, office-by-office statutory dollar breakdowns are specified in the bill for the Office of the Secretary.

With respect to the Coast Guard, a total program level of \$2.417 billion is recommended—an increase of a little over \$10 million above the budget request and \$3.714 million over the fiscal year 1986 adjusted program level. The amounts in the bill would provide for a 5.8-percent increase in operating expenses for fiscal year 1987 and a 21-percent reduction in acquisition, construction, and improvements assuming that certain sums are made available to the Coast Guard from funds appropriated in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act 1986. With respect to acquisition, construction, and improvements, we believe such reductions are reasonable in light of the large, unexpended amounts appropriated for this activity over the last several years. The unobligated balance for this account totals over \$400 million. Excluding acquisition construction, and improvements, the bill reflects more than a \$120-million increase in Coast Guard program levels between fiscal years 1986 and 1987.

We believe this level provides for a balanced program with emphasis on maritime law enforcement—especially drug interdiction; national defense commitments; search and rescue capabilities; dependability and safety of Coast Guard ships, boats, aircraft, and shore facilities; and the welfare and safety needs of Coast Guard person-

nel. It will provide for 38,053 military positions and 5,654 civilian positions, which is essentially the same as the budget request.

For Coast Guard operating expenses, the bill provides a program level of \$1.850 billion for fiscal year 1987. This is \$107.5 million more than the amount provided for similar activities in fiscal year 1986. It is \$13 million below the budget request. The reduction from the budget is based on lower than anticipated fuel costs and inflation, normal slippages in the operational dates for new vessels, shore facilities, and other equipment, and additional management efficiencies.

The bill would also require that not less than \$372.983 million of the operating expenses appropriation be available for drug interdiction activities. This is in keeping with the committee's strong commitment to adequately fund such activities. I invite the Members' attention to the drug interdiction section of the report beginning on page 13, which says that we must have a more coordinated and balanced approach if we are going to make headway in fighting the battle against drugs.

The operating expense funding level of \$1.850 billion will support 37,054 military positions and 4,549 civilian positions. These levels are the same as the budget request and represent increases of 2,415 military and 200 civilian positions over the fiscal year 1986 level.

For acquisition, construction, and improvements, we are recommending an appropriation of \$101.86 million. This appropriation plus an estimated \$102.25 million in unobligated carry-over funds will provide for a total program level of \$204.1 million. The total program level is comprised of \$144.9 million for vessel acquisitions and improvements; \$5.6 million for aircraft; \$27 million for shore facilities; \$3.4 million for aids to navigation; \$1.2 million for command, control and communications, and related systems; and \$22 million for administration, survey and design.

The sum of \$364 million, as requested in the 1987 budget, is provided for the pay of retired military personnel of the Coast Guard and Coast Guard Reserve. This is based on an average of 24,673 personnel on the retired rolls.

For reserve training, \$63.857 million, including \$5 million derived by transfer, is recommended. This will provide for a ready reserve of 18,500 including a selected reserve of 12,500.

The bill includes \$20.1 million for the basic and applied scientific research, development, test, and evaluation projects necessary to maintain and expand the technology required for the Coast Guard's operational and regulatory missions. This amount is es-

entially the same as the fiscal year 1986 level.

For the State recreational boating safety assistance program, we approved the budget request of \$15 million.

The bill also contains appropriations of \$1 million each for the deepwater port liability fund and the offshore oil pollution compensation fund.

For the Federal Aviation Administration, we are recommending a total program level of \$4.906 billion, including a \$1.017 billion limitation on the use of contract authority for fiscal year 1987. This is \$94.373 million more than the fiscal year 1986 adjusted level, and \$392.381 million more than the budget request. This level will provide sufficient funds to continue the restoration of the air traffic control system, continue modernization of the national airspace system, improve our airports, and continue important safety regulatory and research initiatives.

For FAA operations, we recommend appropriations of \$2.832 billion, including \$34.5 million for headquarters administration. This represents an increase of \$107.3 million over the fiscal year 1986 program level of \$2.725 billion. This would provide for 45,669 positions including 20,058 controllers, supervisors, and support personnel for centers and towers, and 4,595 flight service station personnel.

With respect to the air traffic control system, we recommend \$978.791 million and 20,058 positions for the operation of air route traffic control centers, terminal radar approach control facilities, airport traffic control towers, and certain ancillary facilities. This is \$14.3 million and 326 positions above the budget request.

We approved the proposed reductions in overhead staffing for the centers and towers, but recommend additional funds to support an increase of 326 air traffic controllers over the budget request. This increase should support a total of 15,306 air traffic control positions—the 14,306 position level reached in February 1985, plus the additional 1,000 positions announced by the Department of Transportation on September 19, 1985.

Our committee remains concerned about air traffic controller work force staffing. While the FAA has reported progress in improving air traffic control capacity, full performance level staffing is still below 60 percent at some critical centers. In addition, the FAA has been slow to fill the additional 1,000 positions announced last September. As of May 31, 1986, the air traffic controller work force level was 14,168. This is still over 300 positions short of the legislated employment level of 14,480 that must be reached by the end of fiscal year 1986.

We also recommend a partial restoration of the proposed reduction in

overtime funds for air route traffic control centers. The budget assumes a reduction of 180,125 hours of overtime. This restoration of funds would support 100,000 hours of overtime to avoid unacceptable levels of system delays and to accommodate unanticipated traffic growth or other system developments.

The bill also includes \$10.314 million above the budget for the certification and inspection of the airlines and of the general aviation aircraft. This increase is necessary to fully fund the additional 300 safety inspectors and support staff provided in fiscal year 1986, and another 200 inspectors in fiscal year 1987.

We are deeply concerned about the effectiveness of the FAA's aviation safety inspection program. According to the testimony presented by the General Accounting Office, the FAA has not responded effectively to the changes deregulation has brought to the airline industry. Since deregulation, the numbers of air carriers and aircraft have increased dramatically. Yet, in the same time period, the administration proposed significant staffing reductions in such critical areas as air safety inspections. For example, between 1978 and 1983, the FAA reduced its inspector staff by 34 percent—from over 2,000 staff to 1,332 staff.

The GAO believes this slowness to respond to changing conditions was further complicated by basic management deficiencies. For instance, the FAA did not collect data on what inspections were or were not being performed or what its inspections showed. It lacked the standards necessary to provide a framework for making appropriate decisions on the minimum levels of inspections essential to ensure airline compliance with safety standards. Without adequate guidance, FAA regional officials, for the most part, gave priority to certifying new and expanding airlines rather than to inspecting existing carriers.

Although the FAA has begun to respond to these problems and has developed a long-term strategy for improving its inspection program, the GAO concluded that this program cannot adequately ensure that commercial airlines are complying with all FAA safety regulations. Additional inspectors are needed and are funded in this bill. But, this action alone will not correct all of the deficiencies identified by the GAO. Our committee, in concert with the authorizing committee, will continue pursuing the necessary management reforms to ensure that these resources are used wisely. A key part of our effort will be the comprehensive report mandated in section 321(a) of this bill.

Moving on to trust fund contributions, of the \$2.797 billion provided for



FAA operating expenses in fiscal year 1987, the bill specifies that \$691.048 million, or 25 percent of the total, be derived from the airport and airway trust fund. In my view, this is an artificially low level that is caused by an ill-conceived formula contained in authorizing legislation. It is one of the causes for the high trust fund balance we currently have. I would hope that the authorizing committee would change this provision to reflect a straight percentage of the amount appropriated when the program comes up for reauthorization.

For facilities and equipment, the bill contains \$829.914 million for fiscal year 1987, including \$1.914 million derived by transfer. This is a decrease of \$120 million from the fiscal year 1986 adjusted level of \$950.3 million, but is about \$5 million above the budget request.

I know many Members are interested in the funding status for terminal doppler weather radars. These radars should enhance the FAA's wind shear detection capabilities. The bill includes \$88 million—\$22.5 million above the budget—to install these radars at 15 locations. This equipment is an interim response to the wind shear problem until the "optimized" radars are fully developed. We will continue to give the wind shear radar procurement and research and development programs top priority.

With respect to the NAS plan, our committee is becoming increasingly dissatisfied with the FAA's progress in implementing this plan. We have raised several concerns about NAS plan management in the report, which are found on pages 25 and 26. Of particular concern is the NAS plan's eroding benefit-to-cost ratio. According to the General Accounting Office, projected savings have dropped by 33 percent since fiscal year 1982, from \$24.5 to \$16.5 billion. In addition, the General Accounting Office has given troubling testimony to our committee questioning the benefits attributed by the FAA to several major NAS plan projects. This testimony has damaged the credibility of the FAA in assuring the Congress and the taxpayers that the NAS plan is being prudently managed.

In addition to management difficulties, projected NAS plan costs continue to grow. If related project funds provided before 1982 or required after 1992 and requisite NAS plan research and development funds are added to the official cost estimate of \$11.7 billion, the NAS plan now will cost over \$15 billion. This amount will increase by an estimated \$550 million with the addition of the terminal doppler weather radar project. At the same time, the FAA has not realized the productivity savings from new equipment as originally predicted. The 5-month delayed submission, until Sep-

tember 1986, of the congressionally requested annual NAS plan update only serves to reinforce our apprehension about NAS plan management, and justifies the need for a comprehensive and realistic assessment of the plan's initial objectives and whether such objectives still can be accomplished in a cost-effective manner.

With respect to FAA research, engineering, and development, we recommend \$141.7 million, which is an increase of \$7.2 million over the budget request. This includes \$3 million over the budget request for TCAS-III implementation and \$5.5 million over the budget for airport capacity research. We have deleted the request of \$1.548 million for the DUATS project.

The bill also includes a \$1.017 billion obligation limitation on airport development and planning grants. This is the highest funding level ever provided for this program.

The bill also includes \$35 million for the operation and maintenance of metropolitan Washington airports, and \$50 million for construction projects at those airports.

We have also recommended reducing the FAA's authority to borrow from the Treasury to pay defaulted aircraft purchase loans from \$125 to \$75 million. Testimony indicates that the FAA has paid approximately \$169 million as a result of defaulted loans. The amount of these defaults is alarming and we believe that the FAA should fully explore other alternatives with the creditors, such as rolling over the loan or extending the payment period before it agrees to pay for a default. We have, therefore, reduced the amount of borrowing authority to \$75 million to give added incentive to employ such options.

#### FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

Under the Federal Highway Administration, the bill provides for a total fiscal year 1987 program level of \$14.117 billion in highway aid. This includes a limitation of Federal-aid highway contract authority obligations of \$13.125 billion. The total FHWA program level is \$1.311 billion more than the budget request and almost \$258 million less than that provided in fiscal year 1986.

For budget planning purposes, we have assumed that highway programs will, for the most part, be reauthorized at the same levels and to the same extent as provided in current law for fiscal year 1986.

I would like to emphasize that the highway funding levels in this bill are higher by \$2 billion than the amount of income expected to come into the highway trust fund. We estimate that fiscal year 1987 outlays attributable to the highway account of the trust fund will be about \$14.096 billion. This compares to estimated total fiscal year 1987 income credited to the highway account of approximately \$12.053 bil-

lion, based on current law. The \$2.043 billion difference will serve to reduce the estimated \$9.141 billion balance in the highway account by about 12.4 percent.

The bill provides a total of \$202.75 million for FHWA administrative expenses, \$3.441 million below the budget request.

The bill also contains an appropriation of \$23.5 million for railroad-highway crossings demonstration projects in five different cities.

A \$10 million limitation on highway-related safety grants is also contained in the bill for fiscal year 1987, the same as the budget request, and an appropriation of \$7 million is recommended for highway safety research and development, which is the same as the budget request.

We recommend funds for 11 additional items not in the budget request: \$1.887 million for an airport-highway demonstration project, \$11 million for an intermodal urban demonstration project, \$9 million for reconstruction of a section of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, \$13.9 million for an expressway gap closing project, \$10 million for highway safety and economic development demonstration projects, \$4 million for an airport access demonstration project, \$3 million for a highway-railroad grade crossing safety demonstration project, \$4 million for a nuclear waste transportation safety demonstration project, \$1.5 million for Theodore Roosevelt Bridge capacity improvements, and \$5 million for an airport access highway demonstration project.

For motor carrier safety, the bill includes \$20.447 million, \$932,000 over the budget request, to continue the activities of the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety.

The bill also provides \$18 million to liquidate contract authority obligations for the Motor Carrier Safety Grant Program. This assumes enactment of authorizing legislation to provide contract authority for this program as requested by the administration.

#### NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

For the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, the bill includes a total program level of \$98.46 million for operations and research. There were over 43,500 traffic deaths in 1985 and auto accidents still kill our young people more frequently than any other cause. This is \$9.63 million more than the program level proposed in the budget request.

The bill also reserves \$10 million of this appropriation to finance the second year of a 3-year pilot project to implement the recommendations contained in the National Academy of Science's report "Injury in America." The committee is hopeful that the re-

search recommendations in that report can produce larger payoffs in the injury-related research work currently funded by the NHTSA.

We also recommend a limitation on obligations for the State and Community Highway Safety Grant Program of \$121.06 million, an increase of \$11.06 million over the budget request.

For the Alcohol Safety Incentive Grant Program, we have established a limitation on obligations of \$14.4 million in fiscal year 1987. This is the same as the amount obligated in fiscal year 1986 for this program.

For safety education and information grants, we have established a combined fiscal year 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, and 1987 obligation limitation of \$4.75 million. This is the same amount as provided in fiscal year 1986. We will assess the results of past and ongoing media campaigns before we will recommend additional funding for such purposes.

Mr. Chairman, for the Federal Railroad Administration, major recommendations include a program level of \$26.7 million for railroad safety, \$9.8 million for railroad research and development, a program level of \$26.75 million for Office of the Administrator expenses—that includes \$10 million for local rail service assistance grants—\$9 million for the Redeemable Preference Share Program, and \$5 million for Conrail commuter transition assistance.

For Amtrak, we are recommending the sum of \$613 million, including \$11 million derived by transfer. Of course, the President proposed deleting all Amtrak funds and the Congress has overwhelmingly rejected this proposal year after year. We expect that all existing routes and services will be maintained at this funding level—including section 403(b) and 403(d) service under the existing funding formulas. Bill language is also included continuing the statutory conditions for rehabilitating and operating a new route between Philadelphia and Atlantic City, and establishing a 60-percent Federal match for the Westside connector project in New York City.

In addition, the bill includes \$16.962 million for Northeast corridor capital improvements. This sum will be of direct benefit to Amtrak.

With regard to Amtrak, the committee report expresses displeasure over repeated allegations of abuse by mid-level Amtrak management employees of Amtrak's work force discipline and grievance process. The effects on work force morale caused by past abuses and allegations of continuing abuses can only have a negative impact on employee productivity and efforts to reduce operating costs. Therefore, we reduced the recommended subsidy by \$1 million for poor management practices. The Department of Transportation inspector general has also been

requested to conduct a full investigation of Amtrak's discipline and grievance process, which is described in detail on page 114 of the report. We think this problem can be remedied, and we are going to insist that Amtrak's top management make this a priority item.

For the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, a total program level of \$3.481 billion is recommended for fiscal year 1987. This is \$2.261 billion more than the budget request, but \$50,005 million less than the adjusted fiscal year 1986 program level.

Under the Formula Grant Program, we recommend an appropriation of \$2 billion. The President's budget did not request any new general fund appropriations for this program in fiscal year 1987. Instead, the budget assumed enactment of new legislation to establish a Block Grant Program funded from the mass transit account of the highway trust fund. The President's proposed block grant would reduce by two-thirds the funding going into similar transit functions in fiscal year 1986. I think this approach amounts to almost a complete abandonment of mass transit in this country and its good that such an approach was discarded by the authorizing committee.

The amount recommended for formula grants in fiscal year 1987 is \$57.55 million below the amount provided in fiscal year 1986. The operating assistance component of this appropriation would not be limited in any way other than what is provided by the formulas established in the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982.

The bill also includes language limiting obligations for transit discretionary grants to \$1.015 billion. This is \$14.457 million more than the fiscal year 1986 limitation. As stated previously, the President proposed combining this program with the Formula Grant Program and certain other highway programs into a Block Grant Program. I invite the Members' attention to pages 101 through 105 of the report for a detailed description of how these funds are to be distributed.

With respect to new starts, the bill contains \$110 million for the metro rail project in Los Angeles. In last year's continuing resolution, the House approved language which required the Secretary of Transportation to negotiate a full-funding agreement for this project. Two weeks ago, the Secretary announced that agreement had been reached to proceed with metro rail construction. Ground-breaking is scheduled for September.

Metro rail will be a very cost effective use of Federal funds. In fact, 45 percent of metro rail's cost will come from non-Federal sources—almost twice that required by law. For instance, in 1980 Los Angeles County

taxpayers approved a sales tax increase to help fund this project. Also, Gov. George Deukmejian has pledged \$400 million in State funds toward the cost of metro rail.

The construction of this project will allow Los Angeles to begin to solve the intolerable traffic congestion and poor air quality pervasive to that city. This project has a long history of widespread, bipartisan support, and we look forward to its completion.

The bill also includes \$200 million for transit projects that have been substituted for interstate highway projects. Of this amount, 50 percent is to be distributed on a formula basis and 50 percent on a discretionary basis. The discretionary funds will be distributed as outlined on pages 105 and 106 of the report.

The bill appropriates \$217.239 million as authorized by Public Law 96-184, the Stark-Harris legislation, to continue construction of the Washington, DC, Metrorail system.

The bill also provides a total of \$48.6 million for research and administrative expenses of UMTA.

The bill limits the administrative expenses of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to \$1.925 million, \$65,000 less than the budget request. In addition, we recommended an appropriation of \$2 million to complete necessary concrete repairs at the Eisenhower lock.

For the Research and Special Programs Administration, the bill contains an appropriation of \$20.8 million, \$776,000 more than the budget request. This would provide for three additional hazardous materials enforcement/regulatory personnel, and two additional pipeline safety inspectors above the budget request.

For the Office of the Inspector General, the bill includes an appropriation of \$27.77 million. This is \$140,000 more than the budget request.

Title II of the bill contains \$560.25 million in new budget authority for six transportation-related agencies and commissions. This is \$370,000 below the cumulative budget requests, and \$11.17 million above last year's adjusted level.

More specifically, we recommend \$1.975 million for the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, \$22.4 million for the National Transportation Safety Board, a total of \$47.95 million for the Interstate Commerce Commission, \$434.173 million for the Panama Canal Commission, \$2.297 million for the United States Railway Association, and \$51,663,569 for the Federal share of interest payments for the bonded indebtedness of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

Mr. Chairman, there are several general provisions in this bill that will be of interest to the Members, including



section 330 dealing with limitations concerning South Africa on the awards of Government contracts; section 331 prohibiting the takeoffs and landings in the United States of South African aircraft; and section 332 dealing with the reemployment eligibility of fired air traffic controllers. The general provisions are summarized on page 120 of the report.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the body is a fiscally responsible bill which I believe provides adequate funding for our transportation programs. I ask for its favorable consideration and approval.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1840

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is a great pleasure to rise in strong support of the fiscal year 1987 transportation appropriations bill. Chairman BILL LEHMAN has done an outstanding job of balancing both the competing needs of the various transportation modes, and accommodating as many Members as possible who requested projects. All achieved despite the limited dollars available. Proof that miracles do happen.

This is a bill with bipartisan support. It was developed in the spirit of cooperation and shows the subcommittee's commitment to safe and effective transportation. It is a pleasure to work with the other subcommittee members, SILVIO CONTE, CARL PURSELL, FRANK WOLF, MARTY SABO, BILL GRAY, BOB CARR, DICK DURBIN, and BOB MRAZEK, on such an interesting and important assignment.

While I am mentioning the members of the subcommittee, let me also recognize the staff who work on this bill: Jeff Jacobs and Kenny Kraft for the minority and Tom Kingfield, Greg Dahlberg, Lucy Hand, Linda Muir, and Janet Oakley for the majority.

The bill provides \$10,284,900,569 in new budget authority. This is about \$3.3 billion above the President's budget request and the Office of Management and Budget has announced its opposition. However, the amount recommended is only \$137,924,000 more than the amount enacted to date in fiscal year 1986. When the fiscal year 1986 appropriations are adjusted to reflect certain Coast Guard programs which were supplemented by money from the Defense appropriations bill, the fiscal year 1987 amount is actually \$318,701,000 less than 1986. The section 302(b) allocation is \$10,302,000,000. So we are under that figure.

With respect to outlays, based on CBO figures, our report shows the bill to be \$13 million over the section 302(b) budget allocation in discretion-

ary outlays but \$508 million under the allocation in mandatory outlays. Overall then, the bill is \$495 million under the 302(b) allocation in outlays.

With respect to last year, the bill is \$252 million over in discretionary outlays but \$909 million under in mandatory outlays. This is a net at \$657 million under last year's outlays.

The chairman has explained what is recommended in the bill so I will not repeat it. Some of the highlights are:

First, \$21 million for payments to air carriers,

Second, \$1,858,800,000 for Coast Guard operating expenses,

Third, \$2,800,447,000 for Federal Aviation Administration operations,

Fourth, a total of \$829,914,000 for FAA facilities and equipment,

Fifth, a highway obligation ceiling of \$13,125,000,000,

Sixth, an appropriation of \$613 million for Amtrak,

Seventh, \$2 billion for section 9 formula grants in the Urban Mass Transportation Administration,

Eighth, a general provision which bars the Secretary from denying reemployment to the fired air traffic controllers "as a Class" solely because of participation in the illegal strike,

Ninth, a general provision directing the Secretary to deny landing rights to flights originating in South Africa, and

Tenth, a general provision prohibiting UMTA from forcing privatization on local transit authorities. It should be a local decision.

It is a good bill. It is virtually at last year's level. It is under the section 302(b) allocation. For all these reasons, it deserves your support. I urge that it be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] has 25 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY]

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the gentleman from Florida, in a discussion that I believe the committee will find worthy of attention. The Boston World Trade Center is currently developing a state-of-the-art people mover for the Commonwealth Flats area of Boston. They are well on their way to establishing the first daily operating monorail in an urban center.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. If the gentleman will yield. The Federal role in such projects is often limited to architectural design and technical support. What is the level of Federal involvement that the Commonwealth Flats people mover is seeking?

Mr. MOAKLEY. This project has been totally funded by private and State dollars and will operate through

private funding entirely. The Boston Seaport Monorail, Inc. is requesting \$1 million in UMTA funding for technological and design assistance. The developers will be using this small grant to leverage \$24 million in private investment.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Where will this system be developed and produced?

Mr. MOAKLEY. In a time where we see more and more examples of foreign technology used to solve domestic problems, it gives me great pleasures to report that this system is being technically planned in Florida and manufactured in Vermont. The developers made the domestic production of the monorail a requirement in their contract. The Transportation Group Inc., a division of Bombardier, Inc., are the producers of the highly successful monorail system for the Disney facilities. The Boston system will incorporate proven technology and the most sophisticated design elements. The monorail will have a capacity of serving 5,000 persons per hour. It will be unlike any other existing system and is designed to deal with extreme weather conditions including, ice, snow, and high winds—not unlike those conditions found in many large, Northeastern cities with open harbors.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts is presenting us with a unique plan for developing urban transportation technologies; an opportunity for the Federal Government to implement state-of-the-art methods to alleviate urban congestion and to provide seed funding to attract private sector support and investment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the combination of Florida with New England technology is a pretty good combination.

Mr. MOAKLEY. I thank the subcommittee chairman, and I commend him and his committee for the diligent way they have handled the bill.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN].

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, for the last year, the National Park Service has been studying the issue of noise from aircraft operations over Grand Canyon National Park and how it affects the natural quiet and experience of the park. And I am sure we all are all too familiar with the recent tragic events over the Grand Canyon in which a collision of two aircraft resulted in the deaths of 26 individuals. With 50,000 flights a year currently, and projected steady increases, the problems of safety and noise must be addressed as expeditiously as possible. The House Interior Committee has approved legislation drafted by our distinguished chair-

man, Mr. UDALL, and myself, which, together with the results of the National Park Service study of aircraft operations at Grand Canyon National Park, attempts to address these issues.

However, this aircraft management plan is only half the solution. What is needed at the canyon to compliment this plan, in my opinion, is effective radar coverage. To this point, I do not believe the FAA has attempted to address my concerns in a meaningful fashion. It is my hope that the Department of Transportation or the FAA will use some funds contained in this bill or otherwise available to them, to conduct a study to determine the appropriateness of radar coverage. Before anyone rejects radar at the Grand Canyon out of hand, I believe we should have all the facts in front of us.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. If the gentleman will yield, I congratulate the gentleman for bringing this issue to the attention of the House. I agree with him that this matter is serious enough to deserve prompt attention and I will work with him to initiate this study as soon as possible.

Mr. COUGHLIN. I, too, congratulate the gentleman for his attention to this matter and I will assist him in his efforts to initiate this study.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the chairman and Mr. COUGHLIN for their cooperation on this issue.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that the subcommittee is certainly aware of the great tragedy that did occur at the Grand Canyon and particularly aware of the tremendous work that the gentleman from Arizona has done with regard to this and with regard to trying to increase both the safety and the public use of the Grand Canyon. It is a monument to his efforts. It is very important indeed. We certainly want to work with him in his effort to initiate this study.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and the chairman of the subcommittee for their consideration and assistance and cooperation on this issue. With their help I believe we can resolve this issue.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, at this time I have no further request for time. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yield this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] that it is with deep concern that we learned recently of the Virginia Highway and Transportation Board's action to increase the restricted hours on Inter-

state 66 inside the Capital Beltway. As you know, the current restrictions are 7 to 9 a.m. and 4 to 6 p.m. Monday through Friday. Beginning August 4, the highway will be further restricted to 6:30 to 9 a.m. and 4 to 6:30 p.m.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. If the gentleman will yield, how does this decision affect the high occupancy vehicle rule on I-66?

Mr. WOLF. The board decided to adopt permanently our proposal to reduce the carpool—HOV—requirements from four to three persons and that action is to be commended. But the decision to lengthen the hours has the potential to worsen traffic congestion in northern Virginia by forcing many hundreds of cars onto already congested roads while I-66—presuming current HOV usage continues—handles an average of less than five vehicles per minute. No information has been presented which would indicate that a significant number of additional carpools could be created at the late hour of 6 p.m. each evening.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. What data is available on the morning hours?

Mr. WOLF. With respect to the morning hours, it is apparent that congestion has been occurring during "fringe periods" of the restricted hours, from 6:30 to 7:15 a.m. and from 8:45 to 9:45 a.m., and therefore prudent action by the board may be justified. However, much of this congestion is because aggressive enforcement of the HOV regulations is lacking. Stricter enforcement of the HOV restrictions, combined with the growing use of the Metrorail system, should reduce congestion during the restricted hours.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Was the board's decision based on an extensive study?

Mr. WOLF. The principal problem with the board's action is that an adequate study and analysis were not performed. The board based its decision on only 1 day of traffic counts, just 12 days after the Metrorail Orange Line extension was opened. A decision of this magnitude which affects thousands of people in northern Virginia requires an extensive study followed by a fair opportunity for the people who will be affected to express their views. Relying on 1 day of traffic counts without the benefit of public comment is simply insufficient justification for such a major change in the operation of I-66.

Mr. Chairman, I want to be on record voicing my extreme concern over this decision and will be taking a close look at its impact on the commuters in northern Virginia. Your watchful eye on this matter, as one who has a deep commitment to meeting the country's transportation needs, would be helpful and I would appreciate your indulgence at some later date in addressing this issue should it become necessary.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. I can understand your concern over this matter, Mr. WOLF, and will be happy to monitor the situation on I-66 as these tighter restrictions are implemented.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee.

□ 1855

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING].

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I have some concerns about appropriations under this bill that might support a highway project in my district which could have potentially devastating effects on an important local historic district, the village of Hudson, OH.

Title 49, United States Code, section 303, commonly known as section 4(f), requires that projects may only be approved if they "include all possible planning to minimize harm to the historic site resulting from the use" and that impinging development may only go forward if there is "no alternative." However, in considering an expansion of a Federal-aid highway which runs through Hudson, the Ohio Department of Transportation has not planned a way to minimize harm to the historic district and maintains that there is no alternative to expansion of the road within the historic area. In fact, local officials have outlined alternatives and have requested input from the State as to how adverse effects on the historic resources can be mitigated. No meaningful response has been made to either point, so far.

Clearly, planning for the highway first and mitigation of harm to historic resources last, as the State is proposing to do, will invariably put highway interests in a position superior to historic preservation interests. It is my understanding, and I seek the chairman's advice, that Congress intended for highway conflicts with historic resources to be worked out at the early planning stages and that planning for historic resources only after highway plans are firmly laid out does not meet the standard set by Congress, requiring that all possible planning be done.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, my understanding is the same as that of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Chairman, I would add that the State's plans for the Route 91 extension through Hudson may also be premature. At this very moment, the expansion of a nearby, parallel road, Route 8, into a four-lane superhighway is being financed by the Federal Highway Trust Fund. It is expected to be completed within a few months. Would it not be more in keeping with Federal highway



policy, as well as fiscal prudence, if the State would postpone plans for expansion of Route 91 through Hudson until the effect of the completed Route 8 project can be accurately measured, and particularly its effect in realigning traffic on Route 91?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. That is my understanding of the Federal policy.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, when we get to the appropriate point in the bill, I intend to give the House the opportunity to select once again among priorities that we may wish to address.

As the committee has pointed out, they are up against their 302 budget allocations, and so we have to look internally into the bill to try to find ways of readjusting priorities.

It would be my intent to look at the Offices of the Secretary, to look at NTSA, in order to find some moneys that are now devoted to enforcement of the 55-mile-an-hour speed limit in order to transfer those moneys to the Coast Guard for drug interdiction.

The Committee's report goes into some detail as to what is being done in the drug interdiction area. It indicates that they are not certain that this is exactly the way that we ought to proceed for the future.

I would say, though, that I have recently seen at least a preliminary proposal of the bipartisan drug plan that we have coming forward in this House, and it indicates that we are going to need another \$90 million of money for the Coast Guard. Now that is \$90 million that cannot be gotten within this year's budget unless we find some way to provide some funding. I do not suggest I can find \$90 million. However, I do believe that there is about \$20 million that can be gotten out of a law enforcement priority determination.

Let us understand that is what we would be doing here. Under this program that is funded in this bill, we now give about \$20 million to local police authorities or to State police authorities for the enforcement of the 55-mile-an-hour speed limit. In other words, we place a law enforcement priority on the country that suggests that we ought to spend \$20 million of taxpayers money to see to it that people drive 55 miles an hour rather than 56 miles an hour. That is exactly what we are doing. We are saying that that difference between 55 and 56 miles an hour is so important that we ought to spend \$20 million on it.

I suggest that many of the American people would regard it as being a greater priority to spend the \$20 million trying to interdict drugs coming into this country and giving that money to the Coast Guard to do it.

That is what my amendments will seek to do.

As usual, we will have to go through a rather elaborate procedure in order to get from here to there. But it seems to me that it is a priority determination that this House may want to do, because it seems to me if you have law enforcement priorities for this country, they ought to be aimed at doing something about drugs rather than aimed at doing something about the 55-mile-an-hour speed limit.

It seems interesting to me that as the speeds have been increasing on our highways, the fatality rate has been steadily going down. However, as drugs have flowed into this country, there is no doubt that the fatality rate in drugs has gone up.

If we want to talk about saving lives, the way to save lives right now is to stop drugs rather than spending police time and effort on a 55-mile-an-hour speed limit.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, in addition to serving on the Committee on Appropriations and this subcommittee, I also have the honor of serving on the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control as the second ranking minority member on that committee.

If the gentleman were transferring funds somehow to increase the funding for drug abuse education, I would have great sympathy with what the gentleman is doing. And I might myself have some amendment to that effect at some point.

But we have in this bill right now millions of dollars for Coast Guard interdiction. Yet the Coast Guard cannot tell us in the Select Committee whether they interdict 4 percent of the drug traffic or 10 or 30 percent, particularly when it comes to cocaine, which is the epidemic at the present time. Cocaine is the basis for so-called crack. It is terribly difficult to interdict, particularly any shipments on the high seas because such a small quantity of it is so very potent.

Somehow I believe, and have believed for some time, that we have misplaced our priorities in our programs for drug abuse, and that indeed we should be spending more in drug abuse education here to discourage young people from taking drugs than in interdiction and law enforcement.

Those are all very appealing things to do. But I hope at some point the gentleman might rethink his programs for combating drugs and try to direct the funds in other directions because our ability to interdict has at best been a very minimal success.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will allow me to respond, the problem is I cannot get to drug abuse education in

this bill. There are no drug abuse education programs in this bill. We will have a bill coming later on, and that may be something that we want to address.

But we ought to address the war on drugs at the places where we can come up with resources.

What I am saying to the gentleman is that the bipartisan plan that is being developed around here indicates that there is a need for \$90 million more for the Coast Guard. I say to the gentleman that there is no room in this bill for that additional \$90 million unless we provide it. We cannot get the \$90 million. I am saying that maybe we can get maybe \$20 million of that. It seems to me we ought to move in that direction.

It seems to me that the other day when we had the Drug Enforcement Administration up and we had \$50 million there, some of that money might have been used for educational programs, but the House turned that down.

It seems to me that there is no place that we are willing, where we can make the transfers, to come up with the money for the drug fight.

All this gentleman is attempting to do is provide some of the resources in some of these bills so that, when we get to that drug fight, we do not come back here, as the Speaker has suggested recently that we are going to do, and that is ignore the budget and ignore the deficit for this program. I do not think the American people are going to be very happy with us if we do that either.

It seems to me that when we can find places to change our priorities, now is the time to do it. That is all I am trying to do.

□ 1905

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] has 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, but I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just say first that I hope we will not take funds from programs that are today saving lives and transfer them to other programs that may be more questionable in their ability to save lives. Also I hope that we do not take funds from what are essentially very small programs in terms of the total number of dollars involved in them and transfer them to other programs that are very, very large programs in terms of the total number of dollars involved in them.

The distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from

Florida [Mr. LEHMAN], who is as concerned about drug abuse as any Member of this House and who is our friend, has crafted a carefully balanced bill, one that I hope will be considered and passed by this House as the subcommittee has proposed.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] yields back the balance of his time.

Does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] yield back the balance of his time?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] for his remarks, and I just want to associate myself with the position that he has taken on the enforcement of the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit and the necessity for keeping those funds available for this purpose.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding.

The implication of what the gentleman from Pennsylvania said was that the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit is in fact reducing fatalities. Now, the recent studies are showing that despite the fact that speeds are going up, the fatality rate is coming down.

Does the gentleman have information to refute that, or does the gentleman have information to refute the fact that the number of lives lost per million miles driven in foreign countries, where they have higher speed limits than we do, is in fact lower than what we have in this country?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have a lot of facts and a lot of information. There have been 10,000 lives a year saved since 1972. I think a great many of those lives have been saved due to the enforcement of the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit.

I do not think we should be playing dollar games with programs that save lives, not only lives but mutilations and injuries to people who have been in accidents.

I believe that the cost of lives lost through the years in automobile accidents in this country is greater than the number of lives lost by heart disease and cancer combined, because car accidents are what kill young people. That is where you lose the potential years of life.

Mr. Chairman, I associate myself, as I said, with the remarks of the other gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], and I will oppose very strongly the position taken by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Yes, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just wanted to point out to the gentleman, though, that if we can keep drugs off the streets, that also saves lives, and it seems to me that there is much empirical evidence that keeping drugs off the streets right now is in fact lifesaving, whereas there are all kinds of statistics which question whether or not the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit is playing any role whatsoever at the present time in saving lives.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to continue the debate any further at this time, but I would say that we have put a floor in the Coast Guard budget of over \$370 million for drug interdiction. Now the \$20 million that the gentleman wants to take from highway safety is not going to make that much improvement in drug interdiction, but it could cause a lot of deaths on the highways that otherwise would not occur.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see any need to debate the matter further now, and I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. I would only say, Mr. Chairman, that it is a debate worth having.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to commend the members of the committee for having the integrity to restore the funding that will allow 750 positions to be retained at flight service stations around the country. The administration requested that this funding be eliminated. This is indeed a victory for the Nation's general aviation pilots who rely so heavily on flight service stations.

As you may recall, I led the effort in the 98th Congress to maintain funding of the flight service stations until the automated equipment that was to replace the FSS was in place and working. I am so pleased to see that effort being carried forth today.

The safety of the general aviation pilots should not be compromised for anything, and especially not for productivity improvement as the FAA has proposed. The FAA believes that if the existing flight services are consolidated with automated facilities right now, there would be a significant cost savings. The committee wisely was not convinced of such a savings. While I support the new automated flight service stations, I believe that the pilots of our great Nation deserve a tested, proven, and on-line replacement system before the ties are cut from the existing flight service stations. This bill provides that.

The flight service stations have performed a vital service to the general aviation pilots over the years. They aid in flight assistance on pre-flight, inflight, and emergencies; and in the dissemination of weather information. Without these services, the general aviation pilots would be grounded.

Once again, I commend the committee on their action and urge favorable passage of this bill. Thank you.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to stress the importance of funding for rural transportation. I urge my colleagues to look closely at the inequities of allocation between urban and rural transportation.

I have introduced legislation which will increase the proportion of the Urban Mass Transportation Act [UMTA] allocated to rural transportation. This legislation would increase the funding formula for section 18 of UMTA from 2.93 percent to 5 percent. This would be accomplished by reducing the percentage for each of the two urban categories by about 1 percent.

For too long, rural areas have been relying on a disproportionately low percentage of funding for transportation. Although 39 percent of the national population live in rural areas, they receive less than 3 percent of the transportation funds. Thus, increasing the rural formula allocation to 5 percent is only a small step toward equity.

In rural areas, public transportation is often the only means of transportation for the elderly and the handicapped. Thus, public transportation is of vital importance if these groups are to maintain their independent functioning in the community. Children, too, benefit from public transportation in rural areas. Many Head Start and nursery school programs depend on public systems for transporting children to and from their programs. In spite of this, numerous witnesses testified, in hearings held by the Subcommittee on Human Services of the Select Committee on Aging, that large commercial bus companies are reducing the number of rural stops because they are losing money due to the low number of riders. As a result, specialized and more economical types of public transportation are increasingly necessary in rural areas.

Currently, there are 2.5 million nonurban households with no car, and another 10.2 million households with only 1 car. Without commercial bus routes, those living in rural areas can become isolated and may find themselves without access to other systems, such as taxi service.

I recognize that all UMTA Programs have been reduced. This should serve as a challenge to all public transportation systems, rural as well as urban, to become increasingly efficient and creative in managing their Federal dollars. Although, because of labor costs, urban transportation is more costly to operate than rural transportation, funding is very skewed. At present, UMTA spends \$28 per capita for transportation in large urban areas as compared to only \$1 per capita in nonurban areas. I believe it is time that the rural population received a larger share of the pie.

Mr. Chairman, the current 2.93-percent set-aside was established in 1982, and simply reflects a historic breakdown between urban and rural transportation. It does not reflect need or equity. I, therefore, urge my distinguished colleagues who represent urban areas to consider a more balanced division between urban and rural funding for transportation.



Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. OWENS] having assumed the chair, Mr. PANETTA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5205) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

**CERTIFICATION WITH RESPECT TO THE BINARY CHEMICAL MUNITIONS PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 99-248)**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OWENS) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Tuesday, July 29, 1986.)

**INTRODUCTION OF BILL TRANSFERRING THE OLD U.S. CUSTOM HOUSE IN NEW YORK CITY TO THE MUSEUM OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I join today with several of my colleagues in introducing legislation to transfer the Old U.S. Custom House in New York City to the Museum of the American Indian.

The Museum of the American Indian is one of the great, largely undiscovered treasures of the Western Hemisphere. Presently located in cramped quarters in Upper Manhattan, the museum contains nearly a million artifacts, 70,000 negatives and prints; and 40,000 manuscripts, maps, and documents. The collection is derived from the native peoples of North, Central, and South America.

Founded in 1916 by engineer-financier George G. Heye on land donated by Archer M. Huntington, the museum's collection has grown to include a vast array of Indian artifacts: precious metal ornaments, toys and games, masks, clothing, totem poles, cooking utensils, ceramic vessels, towering house posts, dolls, weapons, and musical instruments.

It has been called the finest collection of American Indian artifacts in the world, but because of limited floor space, only a small frac-

tion of it is on display at any given time. Many of the fragile treasures are kept in old storage facilities where changes in temperature and humidity threaten their preservation.

On those occasions when the works of the museum have been exhibited at more spacious and accessible quarters, the public response has been overwhelming. Two major exhibitions were held in 1978 and 1979 at the U.S. Custom House on Bowling Green in New York City. Each of these shows displayed more than 500 masterpieces. The 1978 exhibit, "Echoes of the Drum," attracted nearly 80,000 visitors, 1,000 a day, despite a city-wide newspaper strike. The second exhibit, "The Ancestors: Native Artisans of the Americas," also attracted great crowds and critical acclaim.

The legislation which I am introducing today would convey the Old U.S. Custom House in New York City to the Museum of the American Indian on a permanent basis, subject only to the normal restrictions and conditions imposed upon the transfer of surplus U.S. property.

Presently, the Old U.S. Custom House, designed by Cass Gilbert and completed in 1907, stands empty under the care of the General Services Administration. As the success of the 1978 and 1979 exhibits demonstrate, the Custom House would make a great showcase for the Museum of the American Indian.

The museum is desperately in need of a new facility. To adequately house its vast collection, the museum requires 100,000 to 150,000 square feet of space. The museum also needs one large building in which to consolidate its scattered facilities. At the moment, the library and research branch of the museum are located some distance from the museum itself.

The Custom House would be an ideal solution. Conveniently located on Bowling Green in Lower Manhattan's Battery Park area, it would permit the museum to expand and improve service to the public and to scholars. Most importantly, it would allow the museum to expand the public viewing area by four or five times. Space would also be available for the Educational Extension Service and the Indian Information Center, making available the computerized catalog of the collection and museum training for Native Americans. And, with appropriate renovation, the Custom House could provide climate-controlled storage for the collection and expansive library and research facilities for scholars.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the swift approval of this legislation. It would make a lasting contribution to the preservation of Native American artifacts and culture.

**CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL STANDARDS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, last week, together with the ranking minority member of the Consumer Affairs and Coinage Subcommittee, Mr. HILER, I introduced the Congressional Gold Medal Act. This bill would formally

establish the congressional gold medal and set standards for its award.

Over the past 200 years, Congress has from time to time voted to award special congressional gold medals to persons found deserving of this high honor. The first gold medal was awarded in 1775 to George Washington. Since then the award has been voted to many distinguished Americans, such as the Wright Brothers, Charles Lindbergh, Thomas Edison, and Dr. Jonas Salk.

Over the past decade an ever-increasing number of bills calling for the award of the congressional gold medal have been introduced. In 1980, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage, I instituted a policy requiring any gold medal legislation to have at least 218 cosponsors before the subcommittee would consider the legislation. Gold medal bills are then brought to the floor under suspension of the rules, so that a two-thirds vote is required for passage. While these requirements have had some effect in assuring that medals are only awarded to those persons considered as truly worthy of this high honor, an ever-increasing number of bills have continued to be introduced.

Over the past several years I have had discussions with Members who have expressed concern that the congressional gold medal was no longer as exclusive or meaningful as it was previously. I shared those concerns, and over the past year have studied what standards should be adopted for the award of congressional gold medals.

I have discussed the development of appropriate standards with the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Mr. HILER, who also is concerned about safeguarding the honor of the congressional gold medal. He worked closely with me in developing H.R. 5236.

In addition to the standards in the bill, the subcommittee will continue to apply the requirement that a gold medal bill must have a majority of the House, at least 218 cosponsors, before subcommittee consideration. Also, to assure that bills are nonpartisan, the subcommittee will require that a gold medal bill be sponsored by at least 40 percent of the Members of each party.

The subcommittee will apply these guidelines to any gold medal bill that has not yet attained 218 cosponsors this Congress. When the next Congress organizes, it is my intention to have these cosponsorship guidelines incorporated into the Banking Committee rules.

H.R. 5236 and these cosponsorship guidelines will assure that the congressional gold medal is awarded only for truly outstanding achievements, and will restore the medal to its rightful place of high esteem.

**MILITARY FLIGHT SAFETY BILLS ARE INTRODUCED**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the Arrow Air military flight crashed last December at Gander, Newfoundland, I began discus-

sions with Senator AL GORE about legislation we could introduce that would protect members of the armed services from ever again having to fly in airplanes as poorly maintained and as dangerous as the one that took 248 servicemen's lives in Gander. I am introducing legislation today, with 19 cosponsors which is the result of those discussions. Other Members of the House, including Congressmen BENNETT, NICHOLS, and HOPKINS, have also introduced legislation with the same objective, and I support their efforts. I am glad that their legislation, including the part I cosponsored, is moving through the Armed Services Committee.

The thrust we are taking today is a requirement that the Federal Aviation Administration notify the Military Air Command promptly whenever a contractor airline is cited for a safety violation. Mr. Speaker, after the Gander accident the congressional investigation disclosed that the Military Air Command was going by what it was told, or not told, by the FAA, so far as safety was concerned. Under the legislation we are introducing today, the Military Air Command would know "promptly" when safety violations are found—something that is supposed to happen now, but as we sadly found out, does not. Under our legislation, the MAC could, should and would hold the flight on the ground until defects are corrected, or until a safe plane is provided.

The bill requires additional actions to make air movement safer for our troops, including "more frequent hands-on and en-route inspections, periodic rotation of field inspectors, prevention of overscheduling of flight crews," and forbids reprisals against airline employees who notify FAA of violations. It also prohibits airlines from employing FAA inspection personnel from going to work for an airline he or she inspected for 2 years after leaving the FAA.

I urge the Congress to act so that our members of the armed services will be protected against having to fly in aircraft the likes of what Arrow Air provided.

I am also introducing a resolution calling for the appropriate committees to look into whether a separate agency responsible for airline safety should be established. It may be that since the FAA is charged with the promotion of air travel, air safety should be in the hands of a different agency.

#### A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE EDWARD A. GARMATZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1966, I was sworn in as a Member of Congress due to a special election. Following this, my first committee assignment was to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which at that time was chaired by the Honorable Eddie Garmatz. As do some new Members, I needed as much guidance as possible, and I found the chairman, the late Eddie Garmatz, was a friend indeed. He was very patient with me and explained the procedures and responsibilities. So, it was obvious that one of my first impres-

sions of Members of Congress centered on Chairman Garmatz. Therefore, my memory is one of fondness and gratitude.

After he saw fit to retire from the strains of Congress, we maintained our friendship. During my multiple hospital confinements, he stayed in close touch, a gesture which I shall always appreciate. Even during the Christmas season he saw fit to remember our friendship with much appreciated and appropriate gifts. Certainly, he shall be missed by many, but perhaps by no one with any more appreciation than I.

To his family and his multiple friends, I offer my deepest sympathy. We can all be grateful for his services to this Nation during his lifetime.

□ 1915

#### A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE ED GARMATZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OWENS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of the passing of Congressman Ed Garmatz.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that we see our way as well as we do because we stand on the shoulders of the leaders who have gone before us. One of those leaders passed away last week. Eddie Garmatz was a Member of this body, a chairman of its Merchant Marine Committee, a defender of America, a wise and visionary leader, and he was my friend. He called me his Republican buddy.

The battles he fought to defend the Nation's seapower and its commerce are still undecided, but we are here to continue those struggles in large part because he was here and worked so hard and so well to protect his dream of restoring the United States as a maritime power.

Yes, Eddie Garmatz, an old style crab feast, clubhouse, Christmas turkey, East Baltimore politician who served 13 terms as Democratic Congressman from the Third District of Maryland and for whom the Federal courthouse in Baltimore is named, succumbed to cancer last week.

Vintage Americana, 2 months ago on the Memorial Day weekend I attended a service at St. Stanislas Cemetery and Congressman Garmatz was there, along with city councilman, Minnie DiPietro, and Senator Joe Bonagna, and the American Legion Post from Fleet Street.

It was an extremely hot day. In fact, it was nearly 100 degrees in the Sun where we were sitting and pretty soon the former Congressman had to leave the stand because it was so hot. I was then told that he had just gotten out of the hospital the day before and it was too much for him.

When I caught up with him, I said, "Eddie, why did you come out on such a hot day?"

And he said, "Helen, I've been doing that for 40 years with that American Legion group and I couldn't miss this one." That is vintage Eddie Garmatz.

Mr. Garmatz served in Congress during the administration of Presidents Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, John Kennedy, Richard Nixon, and Lyndon Johnson; but he not only never lost touch with his East Baltimore roots, he also remained a pretty good friend of amazing numbers of people who voted for him.

Garmatz voted straight democratic, a hundred percent labor, and about a hundred ten percent for U.S. shipping and maritime interests. He rose through the old seniority system during his 25½ years in the House of Representatives to become chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in 1965, and in the sixties Baltimore and Maryland were very fortunate because we had three chairmen of full committees; George Fallon, chairman of the Public Works and Transportation Committee; Sam Friedel, chairman of the House Administration Committee; and Ed Garmatz, chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. He was the last of the three to pass on.

These three powerhouses commuted regularly from Baltimore-Washington by train and a lot of business was conducted on that train in the morning. They decided there how they were going to apply that power for Baltimore and for Maryland and they did their job well.

It was a privilege for me as a newspaper editor to be able to join them on some of these trips and to learn at their feet.

During his term as chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the legislation that was passed was almost like an encyclopedia of maritime legislation, the most famous of which, of course, as far as the merchant marine was concerned, was the passage of the 1970 Merchant Marine Act, which allowed subsidies for the construction of bulk carriers.

It was during his term that there was a first-time interest in oceanography by that committee and he placed it in the Subcommittee for Oceanography and it is still in place today.

Under his regime was passed the National Environmental Protection Act



[NEPA], which is a definitive environmental legislation.

You know, this was typical of him; although the Interior Committee really had jurisdiction there, he managed to pull it away and to get the legislation through his committee.

It was under him that Fisheries came into their own.

There was the passage of the Endangered Species Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, as well as the Port and Waterways Development Act, the Bridge to Bridge Radio Telephone Act, the Tug and Barge Licensing bill, and the Federal Boat Safety Act which of course was the first time that any legislation had been passed in respect to recreational boating.

A considerable amount of Panama Canal legislation was also enacted under his stewardship.

He opposed any vessels made of wood. I remember a number of the battles year after year that he and Congresswoman Lenore Sullivan, who succeeded him as chairman of the House Merchant Marine Committee, the battles they had over whether or not the *Delta Queen* could continue to sail on the Mississippi River. Every year this bill came up and every year there was almost a knockdown battle between the two of them.

I might say that she prevailed on those. The *Delta Queen* is still sailing on the Mississippi.

He formed a subcommittee for the Maritime Academy and it was also he who managed to bring the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association Training School to Baltimore for engineers.

Yes, we can say that he supported subsidies for American shipbuilding, laws encouraging the use of American flagships, money for dredging Baltimore Harbor and even research into the propagation of the blue crab.

He was an early and continuing supporter of Adm. Hyman Rickover and atomic powered submarines and ships.

He fought against the St. Lawrence Seaway, condemned the Defense Department purchase of British ships as a harbinger of doom, chided President Dwight Eisenhower for taking the *Queen Elizabeth* to Europe instead of the *SS United States* and he sought the elimination of sea nettles from Maryland waters.

In 1963 he opposed a contract for "jumbo-izing," that is extending the length of a vessel, the jumbo-izing of two Navy ships because the midsections were to be built in Japan. He wanted the work to be done in private American yards, keeping those yards available in case of a national emergency. How familiar those words are today.

Always a staunch friend of labor and shipping, Mr. Garmatz proudly retained his membership in the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO.

He fought in the House and in the Merchant Marine Committee on behalf of that constituency and those ideals, Maryland shipbuilding first, American shipbuilding second, and foreign shipbuilding, never.

He was still an active member, I mean a card-carrying member of the IBEW when he died.

The maritime people always regarded him as one of their type. In the 1964 campaign in which he defeated city councilman John Pica in the primary, Thomas W. Gleason, in a personal letter to each longshoreman, cited Mr. Garmatz as "one of the best friends that longshoremen have ever had."

In that letter he said:

Eddie Garmatz is not only a friend of the longshoremen and the International Longshoremen's Association, but he is one of the best friends labor has ever had in Congress—a card-carrying union man.

The thing that I think we all loved best about Eddie was that he was always a humble person, never assumed any lofty airs, and he never forgot his friends. No matter what another person's status was, Ed treated all those people with equal respect and humility.

He particularly retained a special place in his heart for the working person, for a waitress, a doorkeeper, an electrician, and always in a restaurant or at a dinner he went into the kitchen first to talk to those people who were preparing the meal before he went out to enjoy his meal.

Testimony to how these little people, the working people felt about him, was evident last week in the Capitol as the clerks, who still remembered him in the Congress, came up to me and said, "He was always such a gentleman."

Although Ed was not a person of fancy words, since his formal education was limited, he was one Member of Congress who knew how to get his bills through. He was one of the best floor managers in the business, and that was because of the way he worked with other Members of Congress and his respect for them, regardless of party. When you look at the agenda of legislation that he enacted while he was chairman, you can see how well he did his work.

One of his best friends and a working colleague was Gerald Ford when he was minority party leader. They frequently worked together to push through several pieces of maritime legislation. Ed called on Mr. Ford when he needed him, and he always was given that support.

Ed did not have any legal experience, but he did not think that mattered much. He always would say, "All you need is a little two-plus-two-equals-four common sense."

"You don't have to be a Harvard graduate or a Rhodes scholar. The

way they decide things today, I wish we had more electricians and plumbers making court decisions and in the legislature."

That was typical Ed Garmatz.

He grew up in Baltimore near Gay and Federal Streets, not far from downtown. He first got into politics in the old 14th precinct of the 8th ward around North Avenue and Gay Street in the heyday of clubhouse politics. He remembered in a newspaper interview that he first joined the Colonial Pleasure Club. Later on he counted 65 political clubs in his Third Congressional District.

He said, "We need to take hayrides and my friends got interested in politics that way."

His early job was in the maintenance department of the American Brewery until he got his first political job as a clerk with the Maryland Racing Commission. After that he became a police magistrate. When a friend joined the Armed Forces in World War II, Ed said, "I would like to have your job," because the pay was better. It was \$4,000 a year.

He started out in politics as an ally of Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., who also was at his funeral services last week. When D'Alesandro became mayor in 1947, he handpicked Garmatz as his successor for the Third Congressional District seat. Garmatz had been D'Alesandro's treasurer and campaign manager.

In 1947, Garmatz spent \$8,500 to get elected to that first term and THOMAS O'NEILL, who was the Sun's political writer at the time, called the election "unusually expensive."

However, Garmatz once reported spending only \$250 a year when he ran unopposed. He was unopposed in five primary and four general elections. When he did have opponents, he routinely demolished them by margins of two, three, four, and five to one.

D'Alesandro predicted that Garmatz would get more than his two opponents at one time, and he did. He got an independent Democrat and a Republican, city councilman Simon Jarosinski and Ed Panetti, and D'Alesandro then delivered Little Italy's third precinct, third ward, the famous "Third of the Third" for Garmatz, 537 to 57 for his benighted opponents.

□ 1930

Baltimore politics were much simpler in those days. Eddie recalled his relationship with Tommy D'Alesandro as his campaign manager. He said:

I used to put a quarter barrel of beer in the back of my car and drive around and find somebody having a birthday or something and we'd set it up and 15 to 25 people would come in. Then Tommy would drop by, accidentally, you know, and say "Hi." After he had shaken hands all around, we would leave and go set up at another place. We

would do that three or four nights a week just to get him acquainted with the people.

Gene Raynor, who is head of the Baltimore City Board of Elections Supervisors, described Mr. Garmatz as a man with a great sense of humor. No matter how he felt, he wanted to say something to make people smile. He always wanted to do something to make people feel good. His generosity was his byword.

For example, he bought dollar bills from the mint in pads like notepaper and would peel them off for kids for birthdays and graduation. He did not want to slight the adults, so he had giant-type bills printed up in ones or fives, sometimes even hundreds, and he would peel them off, handing them to adults, always with a smile. As Gene Raynor said, he always enjoyed a joke, and wanted to make people feel good.

Another person who remembered him so well was Richard Lidinsky, who is now the deputy comptroller of the city, but who was Eddie's aide for several years. He said:

Eddie was just a great guy. Nobody will know of his benevolence to many, many people. Wherever he felt there was a need, he came forward.

Richard described that in a eulogy at the funeral services last week.

Garmatz ran 365 days a year, always quickening his pace a bit during an election season, and he wanted that daily commute because he was able to stay closer to the voters. Even on the last time he attended a public event, on that very hot day, he stood tall and erect. He had grown a bit portly in his middle age, and he always wore three-piece suits, subdued, always with a Maryland black-eyed-susan as a boutonniere, and a four-pointed white handkerchief in the breast pocket. A diamond stickpin frequently gleamed under the splendidly dimpled Windsor knot in his tie.

He grew bald early on, wore glasses and a small neat mustache cut in the style of the leading men of the thirties, and after the LBJ years, affected a trademark wide-brimmed western Stetson hat, although in his early years in Congress he occasionally wore a homburg. In the summer his Stetson hat was a straw hat, and in the winter it was a grey felt.

Yes, we in Maryland and all those who knew him shall truly miss this man who contributed so much to his home State and to our country through his long years of dedication.

Those of us who knew him in Congress, those on the streets of his district, and those who viewed him from afar can only look back with fondness and respect on his many contributions and thank the Lord that he had the strength and will to take the lead in the service of his country.

Mr. Speaker, there is another side to Congressman Ed Garmatz that we all knew about and that was his devotion

to his wife and sister.

The Honorable Richard A. Lidinsky, deputy comptroller of the city of Baltimore, said it so eloquently at the funeral service:

But this was only a part of the whole man, Eddie Garmatz, for it can be proudly stated that he was the devoted, dedicated husband and constant companion of his lovely and gracious wife, Ruth, for 49 years. Without her steadfast support and understanding, capped by her love and devotion, Eddie's accomplishments would have been difficult, if not impossible to achieve.

And, Ed's sister, Elizabeth, who served so conscientiously and efficiently as his top aide in Congress, is due acknowledgement and gratitude for her part in his career.

And I would like to note that his last words just before he slipped into his coma, were: "Take care of Ruth."

He was always so worried about her because she had been in frail and failing health in recent years. Ed frequently said he had to hurry home from an event because he was concerned about "my Ruth."

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, July 22, the Port and city of Baltimore lost one of their best friends of the post-World War II era with the death of former Congressman Edward A. Garmatz, who served in this House from 1947 to 1972.

The Baltimore Sun last week termed Congressman Garmatz' philosophy as being, "Maryland shipbuilding first, American shipbuilding second, and foreign shipbuilding never."

The health of the Port of Baltimore and its shipping-related industries was the first issue of concentration for Congressman Garmatz in his 13 terms in this House. In time, he assumed the chairmanship of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, which we all know is the most important committee in all the House in terms of the shipping industry.

Perhaps the most lasting testament to the effectiveness of Congressman Garmatz was adoption by the Congress of the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 which helped to rejuvenate American shipbuilding. In recognition of all of his efforts on behalf of the Third District and the people of Maryland, the Federal building in Baltimore is named in his honor. That monument and his legislative achievements will long stand as reminders of Congressman Garmatz' commitment to the people of Baltimore.

I join the House in sending our condolences and prayers to Congressman Garmatz' wife, Ruth, and his sister, Elizabeth Garmatz.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to former Congressman Edward A. Garmatz who passed away last week in Baltimore at the age of 83.

Eddie Garmatz was my Congressman when I was growing up in east Baltimore. He was my predecessor in this office. I considered him a friend and an adviser.

During his 25 years in Congress, Eddie Garmatz helped the Port of Baltimore flourish. As the powerful chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Congressman Garmatz laid the foundation for the enactment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1970.

This important piece of legislation provided a vital boost to the shipping industry in Balti-

more and around our country. It boosted an industry but it also boosted our city's economy. It created new jobs in our shipbuilding and ship repair yards.

Around the streets and neighborhoods of east Baltimore, where he himself was born and raised, Congressman Garmatz was known simply as "Mr. Garmatz."

He was a proud man. He was proud of his city, his State, and his Polish heritage. In fact, he was one of the first persons of Polish background ever elected to the U.S. Congress.

In Congress, he fought for the port community but that's not all he did. He worked tirelessly with Mayor Tommy D'Alesandro, Jr., and others to create new jobs and new economic growth for our city.

And he fought just as hard in Congress for programs to maintain our strong national security. He was a strong man and he wanted our Nation to be just as strong.

But with everything he was involved in—with his chairmanships and his other activities—one thing that stands out the most about Eddie Garmatz was that he was never too busy to take time to talk to individual people who were having trouble with the Federal Government.

Eddie Garmatz was elected to Congress term after term because he knew how to be a good representative of the people. He never forgot his roots and he never lost sight of where he was going.

He taught me many things during his life and what I thank him for the most is that he taught me how to be a good Member of Congress.

We all mourn his passing.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to commend Congresswoman HELEN BENTLEY for providing the time for this remembrance of former Congressman Edward Garmatz.

On July 22, 1986, Edward Garmatz lost a battle with cancer. Edward Garmatz represented Baltimore for 12 terms and retired as the dean of the Maryland congressional delegation.

While sadness over his recent death remains with us, the strength of Edward Garmatz' life and his commitment to his constituents will be remembered for many years to come. There are not many who will forget or cease to benefit from his significant contributions and leading role as chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. He was an expert on maritime matters which were a priority to many of his constituents working the Baltimore port.

I join my colleagues in extending heartfelt sympathy to Edward Garmatz' family and in expressing admiration of his service to others.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to take a moment to pay homage to my departed friend and former colleague, Edward Alexander Garmatz. As I take this opportunity to add little grains of sand to that which was Eddie Garmatz, I recall how when I came here as a young fellow in 1965, I was privileged to serve under this tutelage on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I will always remember the finesse and proficiency with which he executed his responsibilities as com-



mittee chairman. He was truly masterful and particularly helpful in both guiding a novice and helping a younger Member to get his feet planted squarely on the ground. For that knowledge, I will always owe him a debt of gratitude.

The range of fond memories I have of Eddie's expertise are many, but among them, I will remember the first year I served on his committee, how I sent him Texas Rio Grande Valley Ruby Red grapefruit. From that good day until the day of his death, Eddie Garmatz ordered Ruby Red grapefruit from the Alamo Fruit Co. in my district. His constancy in this respect was just another sign of the stability which resulted in his translating his exceptional skills as a legislator into substantive achievements on behalf of his State and his country.

Just as each member of a committee imparts an indelible impression, each chairman leaves behind a legacy. Eddie Garmatz will long be remembered not only as a great Congressman, but also as a great chairman.

For having had the privilege of knowing Eddie Garmatz, I am grateful. For serving with him, I am indeed a better man.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to my colleagues from Maryland, HELEN BENTLEY and BARBARA MIKULSKI, for arranging this special order during which we can pay tribute to a dear friend and former colleague we lost last week, Edward A. Garmatz.

From 1947 to 1972, Eddie served in the House of Representatives for the people of Maryland. As a 7-year chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, he was a champion for the U.S. merchant marine fleet. Even during his long tenure in the House, he never relinquished his membership in the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. His dedication to the American workers and proper working conditions made him a leader in the labor field, and a constant friend to union members.

Eddie led—and eventually won—the battle for passage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1970. Although our merchant marine fleet is still beleaguered, particularly in the Great Lakes, that legislation proved to be of great assistance to that ailing industry.

For the 10 years during which Eddie and I served together in Congress, I considered him a true friend and an ally in the work to sustain our merchant marine and to ensure basic worker rights. We shall miss him.

My wife, Nancy, and I wish to express our deep regrets to Eddie's widow, Ruth, and to the Garmatz family.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to the Honorable Edward A. Garmatz, whose death on July 22 was a great loss to the people of this Nation.

Representing the Third Congressional District of Maryland for 25 years before his retirement in 1972, Eddie Garmatz had an outstanding record of service as a strong supporter of the American shipbuilding industry. As chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee from 1966 to 1972, he was highly respected for his expertise on maritime matters, and I was privileged to have had the opportunity to serve with him on this

committee. He was especially sensitive to the needs of the Baltimore port, and worked tirelessly on behalf of his constituents whom he so ably represented.

Congressman Garmatz was a fine legislator, and served the people of the Third Congressional District of Maryland with distinction. He will be missed by all those whom he served, and all those who know him.

Mrs. Annunzio and I extend our deepest sympathy to the members of his family who survive him.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, many Members of this body were saddened last week by the passing of our former colleague, Edward Alexander Garmatz.

When I arrived here as a freshman Member in 1969, Eddie Garmatz had been long on the scene. He was "Mr. Merchant Marine" to me, as he was to many others, for the depth and breadth of his knowledge on the subject was awesome.

Not only was he a source of much information and good advice, he was an exceptional human being, who demonstrated his concern for his constituents and his concern for a robust merchant marine capability in a hundred different ways.

Nor did his concern cease when he left this body. For many years, he served in an advisory capacity to the Maritime Institute, and thus extended his influence to new and succeeding generations of merchant seamen.

I am told that the last time anyone saw him, he was still wearing a black-eyed Susan in his lapel, a symbol of his loyalty to the State of Maryland, and an affirmation all flower-lovers share of the triumph of hope.

Eddie is gone, but his influence will be felt by those he left behind in this body and by American seamen who continue to sail the seas of this world.

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of Edward A. Garmatz, a former Member of this House who served our Nation with great distinction and is remembered with affection by all who knew him.

His congressional district embraced the Port of Baltimore; he became chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and he was a zealous and effective advocate for the American shipbuilding and merchant shipbuilding industries.

I should note that the Port of Baltimore is the hub of the Maryland economy, and Mr. Garmatz is remembered for his contributions to the work and improvement of this port, which is one of our Nation's greatest.

Before the congressional redistricting after the 1970 census, Mr. Garmatz represented the northern part of the district I currently represent, and I know the affection with which he is remembered by my constituents in that area.

He served 13 terms in the House of Representatives, and that fact attests to the popularity he achieved because of his attentiveness to the needs of the people he represented.

Mr. Garmatz was a noble Marylander, a dear friend, and one who deserves the lasting honor and respect of his State and our country.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Edward Garmatz, who passed away last week.

I had the pleasure and privilege of serving with Eddie Garmatz during most of his 13 terms in Congress. I knew him to be a man of great political ability, deep personal conviction, and sound judgment. Eddie's public service career began as a union leader, he then served as a police magistrate, and became a political organizer before coming to serve in Congress. While in the House, Eddie Garmatz chaired the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee for 6 years and was the dean of the Maryland State congressional delegation. As chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee, he was known as an expert on maritime matters and was key in the development of the Port of Baltimore. He was an unabashed proponent of the American maritime industry, and I believe that history has shown that his warnings about the direction in which that industry was headed were correct.

Eddie Garmatz was proud of Baltimore. He never forgot that his roots were in that fine city and he never forgot that responsibility that he owed to his constituents, many of whom were his friends and neighbors. The people of Baltimore and the people of Maryland were well represented by Eddie Garmatz and I believe that they recognized that fact. I know that all the people of Maryland have been saddened by his passing, as have those of us who served in this House with him.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GUNDERSON (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today and tomorrow, on account of a death in the family.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LIGHTFOOT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LEACH of Iowa, for 60 minutes, on August 6.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LEHMAN of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. UDALL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, for 60 minutes, on July 31.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LIGHTFOOT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GRADISON in two instances.  
Mr. BROOMFIELD in three instances.  
Mr. SOLOMON.  
Mr. HENRY.  
Mr. SILJANDER.  
Mr. BADHAM.  
Mr. DENNY SMITH.  
Mr. COURTER in two instances.  
Mr. RITTER.  
Mr. IRELAND.  
Mr. KEMP.  
Mr. McEWEN.  
Mr. HORTON.  
Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.  
Mr. EVANS of Iowa.  
Mr. STANGELAND.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LEHMAN of Florida) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FAZIO.  
Mr. MICA.  
Mr. UDALL.  
Mr. RAHALL.  
Mr. RANGEL.  
Mrs. BOGGS.  
Mr. EVANS of Iowa in two instances.  
Mr. FLORIO.  
Mr. VENTO in two instances.  
Mr. ACKERMAN.  
Mr. ERDREICH.  
Mr. FOWLER.  
Ms. MIKULSKI in two instances.  
Mr. LIPINSKI.  
Mr. HOYER.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1904. An act to provide for the use and distribution of funds appropriated in satisfaction of judgments awarded to the Chippewas of the Mississippi in docket numbered 18-S before the Indians Claims Commission, and for other purposes, and

H.R. 4434. An act to amend the act entitled "An act granting a charter to the General Federation of Women's Clubs."

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 30, 1986, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3969. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the request for appro-

priations for fiscal year 1987 for the Department of Labor, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (H. Doc. No. 99-247); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3970. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the annual report on U.S. Soldiers' and Airmen's Home for fiscal year 1984 and the report of the annual general inspection for fiscal year 1985, pursuant to 24 U.S.C. 59, 60; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3971. A letter from the Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinating Council, transmitting a report of the Commission's interagency coordination activities for the period October 1, 1984 through September 30, 1985, pursuant to Public Law 92-261, section 715; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3972. A letter from the Employee Benefits and Risk Manager, Farm Credit Banks of Louisville, transmitting the farm credit institutions in the fourth district amended retirement plan, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3973. A letter from the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting a report on activities under the Freedom of Information Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3974. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, transmitting a report on the adjustment of the status of nonimmigrants to that of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1255b(c); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3975. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Logistics and Communications), transmitting notice of the decision to convert to contractor performance the grounds maintenance function at Reese Air Force Base, TX, pursuant to Public Law 99-190, section 8089 (99 Stat. 1216); jointly, to the Committee on Armed Services and Appropriations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. BURTON of California: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 516. Resolution waiving certain points of order against consideration of H.R. 5234, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes (Rept. 99-721). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 5265. A bill to amend title 28 and title 11 of the United States Code to provide for the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges, to provide for the appointment of United States trustees to serve in bankruptcy cases in judicial districts throughout the United States, to make certain changes with

respect to the role of United States trustees in such cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. KINDNESS):

H.R. 5266. A bill to require the President to submit legislation for the reorganization of the executive branch in order to more effectively combat drug trafficking and drug abuse; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. WALKER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. McCURDY, and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 5267. A bill to authorize additional appropriations for fiscal year 1987 for the United States Customs Service in order to strengthen the drug enforcement capabilities of the Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5268. A bill to authorize additional appropriations and personnel for the Coast Guard for enhanced drug interdiction activities; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 5269. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1987 for additional assistant United States attorneys and additional special agents of the Drug Enforcement Administration, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 5270. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Department of Defense to enhance assistance by the Armed Forces to civilian drug enforcement agencies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 5271. A bill to establish the National Center for Biotechnology Information within the Department of Health and Human Services as a component of the National Library of Medicine; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BRYANT:

H.R. 5272. A bill to provide a comprehensive national oil security policy; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 5273. A bill to establish the National Lottery Commission to operate a national lottery for the purpose of creating a surplus revenue fund to be used to reduce the Federal debt; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT (for himself and Mr. MINETA):

H.R. 5274. A bill to amend section 404 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit discrimination against handicapped persons in air transportation; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. HILLIS:

H.R. 5275. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for variable rates of interest on loans made by the Veterans' Administration and secured by National Service Life Insurance policies; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 5276. A bill to prohibit certain companies who have filed for bankruptcy from discontinuing medical and life insurance benefits to retirees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mrs. VUCANOVICH):



H.R. 5277. A bill to transfer certain public lands in Nevada to the Toiyabe, Humboldt, and Inyo National Forests; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. MORRISON of Washington):

H.R. 5278. A bill entitled: "The Export Enhancement Improvement Act"; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSE (for himself, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. TORRES, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. OLIN, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. HENDON, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 5279. A bill to promote air safety and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. SHAW:

H.R. 5280. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enable the Armed Forces to engage in arrests, searches, and seizures in drug cases on the high seas and in the territorial waters of the United States and to pursue persons evading arrest onto the land mass of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5281. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to combat drug trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. SKEEN:

H.R. 5282. A bill to prohibit the importation of drug paraphernalia; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STOKES (for himself, Mr. OAKAR, Mr. REGULA, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PEASE, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. FROST, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. McDADE, Mr. HAYES, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. RUSSO, and Mr. ERDREICH):

H.R. 5283. A bill to prohibit certain companies who have filed for bankruptcy from discontinuing medical and life insurance benefits to retirees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. ECKERT of New York, Mr. MARTIN of New York, and Mr. WORTLEY):

H.R. 5284. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey property to the Museum of the American Indian, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. VENTO:

H.R. 5285. A bill entitled: "The Public Employees Social Security Equity Act of 1986"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5286. A bill entitled: "Public Pension Parity Act of 1986"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 5287. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for budget reconciliation for the Medicare and Medicaid programs for fiscal years 1987, 1988, and 1989; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HEFNER (for himself and Mr. CONTE):

H.J. Res. 688. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the month of December 1986, as "Made in America Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

H. Con. Res. 373. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress concerning the need for international cooperative efforts to identify the individuals exposed to radiation as a result of the nuclear accident at Chernobyl in the Soviet Union and to monitor the health status of those individuals so as to increase, for their benefit and the benefit of the citizens of the United States and of all the world's peoples, the level of understanding of the effects of exposure to radiation; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GEPHARDT:

H. Res. 515. Resolution designating membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H. Res. 517. Resolution welcoming Father Lawrence Jenco back to the United States after over 18 months in captivity, encouraging further Syrian help in securing the release of the remaining hostages in Lebanon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSE (for himself, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. OLIN, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. HENDON, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H. Res. 518. Resolution authorizing and directing the appropriate committee or committees of the House or any authorized subcommittee thereof, to study the advisability and feasibility of establishing an independent air safety enforcement agency; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mr. WALKER):

H. Res. 519. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives concerning the policies of colleges and universities with respect to the use of illegal narcotics among their students; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

435. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the legislature of the State of Illinois, relative to the observance of Memorial Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

436. Also, memorial of the legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to American military forces who served in Vietnam; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 471: Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 693: Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. REID, Mr. FRANK, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, and Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H.R. 782: Mr. McKINNEY.

H.R. 1213: Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FAWELL, and Mr. MAVROULES.

H.R. 1436: Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire.

H.R. 1453: Mr. WEAVER, Mr. BATES, Mr. BONKER, Mr. WHEAT, and Mr. DYMALLY.

H.R. 1917: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, and Mr. PASHAYAN.

H.R. 2280: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2423: Mr. EVANS of Iowa.

H.R. 3024: Mr. BOULTER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH.

H.R. 3040: Mr. FRANK, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. WORTLEY.

H.R. 3260: Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 3799: Mr. HAYES, Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. STALLINGS.

H.R. 4179: Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 4282: Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 4299: Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. HENRY, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KEMP, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. SILJANDER, and Mr. ROTH.

H.R. 4349: Mr. PURSELL.

H.R. 4455: Mr. TALLON, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. BEVILL, and Mr. SAVAGE.

H.R. 4535: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. HENDON.

H.R. 4546: Mr. GOODLING and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 4633: Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 4638: Mr. ASPIN, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, and Mr. WIRTH.

H.R. 4639: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 4714: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. BOULTER.

H.R. 4723: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. HENRY, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. KASICH, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MONSON, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 4755: Mr. DYMALLY.

H.R. 4763: Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 4787: Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 4788: Mr. FAZIO, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. TALLON, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 4812: Mr. EVANS of Illinois.

H.R. 4838: Mr. BONIOR of Michigan.

H.R. 4843: Mr. WIRTH, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 4877: Mr. WIRTH.

H.R. 4922: Mr. ROSE and Mr. MOODY.

H.R. 4933: Mr. EDGAR and Mr. MONTGOMERY.

H.R. 4972: Mr. CROCKETT and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 4980: Mr. YOUNG of Florida and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 5000: Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, and Mr. MONTGOMERY.

H.R. 5026: Mr. SMITH of Florida and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 5039: Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. SAXTON, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. PARRIS, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 5043: Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. JEFFORDS.

H.R. 5058: Mr. COURTER, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. COBEY.

H.R. 5066: Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. RUDD, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 5067: Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ROE, Mr. McDADE, and Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 5073: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 5092: Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. DANIEL, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HILER, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. COBEY, Mr. MARTIN of Illinois, and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 5097: Mr. HAMILTON.

H.R. 5144: Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 5154: Mr. WEISS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. SAVAGE.

H.R. 5184: Mr. MONTGOMERY.

H.R. 5225: Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. AU COIN, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 5242: Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. VOLKMER.

H.J. Res. 127: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. BURTON of California, and Mr. FLIPPO.

H.J. Res. 244: Mr. DASCHLE and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.J. Res. 379: Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.J. Res. 390: Mr. CARPER.

H.J. Res. 524: Mr. MOORHEAD.

H.J. Res. 552: Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. YATES, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. REID, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. McDADE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. GRADISON.

H.J. Res. 586: Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. KASICH, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ROSE, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. McDADE, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. YATES, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. HOYER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. COATS, Mr. HENRY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. DAUB, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. WALGREN, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. HEFNER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. FISH, Mr. GREGG, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. NEAL, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. CARR, Mr. DiOGUARDI, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. MINETA, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. WALKER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. STRANG, Mr. CHAPPELL, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.J. Res. 591: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.J. Res. 594: Mr. FUSTER and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.J. Res. 655: Mr. BARNES, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BOSCO, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. COELHO, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.J. Res. 683: Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. MAVROULES.

H. Con. Res. 129: Mr. WYDEN.

H. Con. Res. 233: Mr. BRUCE.

H. Con. Res. 339: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H. Res. 373: Mr. CONTE and Mr. DAVIS.

H. Res. 475: Mr. DeLAY.

H. Res. 498: Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. HOYER, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FROST, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. RANGEL.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

### Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

442. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the county commission of Loudon County, TN, relative to the Tennessee Valley Authority; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

### H.R. 4370

By Mr. COURTER:

—At the end of title V (page 68, after line 3) add the following new section:

SEC. 503. WAIVER OF CERTAIN REPORTING, NOTIFICATION, AND STUDY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), effective on January 1, 1987, any provision of law contained in title 10, United States Code, title 37, United States Code, or in any other provision of law contained in any Act authorizing appropriations to or for the Department of Defense or in any Act making appropriations to or for the Department of Defense that requires the President or any official or employee of the Department of Defense to submit in writing any report, notification, or study to Congress or to any committee of Congress shall not be effective to the extent that such provision requires the submission in writing of such report, notification, or study.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to any provision of law enacted on or after the date of enactment of this Act or to any provision of law that requires the submission of the following reports, notifications, and studies:

(1) The annual reports, statements, and recommendations required by section 133(c) of title 10, United States Code, relating to the accomplishments of the Department of Defense.

(2) The annual report required by section 133(e) of such title, relating to foreign policy, major military missions, and military force structure.

(3) The reports required by subsection (b)(5) of section 139 of such title (as redesignated by section 104(6) of this Act) and the annual report required by subsection (g) of such section, relating to operational test and evaluation activities.

(4) The annual report required by section 142 of such title (as redesignated by section 104(1) of this Act), relating to North Atlantic Treaty Organization readiness.

(5) The reports required by section 1464(c) of such title, relating to the status of the

Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund.

(6) The annual report required by section 2208(k) of such title, relating to the condition and operation of working-capital funds.

(7) The notifications required by section 2233a(a)(1) of such title, relating to expenditures and contributions for acquisition of facilities for reserve components.

(8) The notifications required by section 2304(c)(7) of such title, relating to the use of procurement procedures other than competitive procedures.

(9) The notifications required by section 2306(h)(3) of such title, relating to cancellation ceilings in certain multiyear contracts.

(10) The annual report required by section 2313(d)(4) of such title, relating to subpoenas issued by the Director of the Defense Contract Audit Agency to obtain contractor records.

(11) The annual report required by section 2349 of such title, relating to North Atlantic Treaty Organization acquisition and cross-servicing agreements.

(12) The semiannual report required by section 2357 of such title, relating to contracts in excess of \$50,000 entered into by the military departments for research and development.

(13) The notifications required by section 2394(b)(2) of such title, relating to contracts for energy or fuel.

(14) The annual report required by section 2397(e) of such title, relating to the names of certain employees and former employees of defense contractors.

(15) The notifications required by clauses (B) and (C) of section 2401(b)(1) of such title, the cost analyses required by section 2401(e)(1) of such title, and the reports required by section 2401(e)(2) of such title, all relating to the long-term lease or charter of vessels and aircraft by the military departments.

(16) The notifications required by subsection (c)(1) of section 2403 of such title and the annual report required by subsection (e)(2) of such section, relating to waivers of certain requirements for contractor guarantees.

(17) The notifications required by paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 2407(d) of such title, relating to certain contracts awarded by the Department of Defense in connection with North Atlantic Treaty Organization cooperative agreements.

(18) The annual report required by section 2457(d) of such title, relating to the policy to standardize equipment, ammunition, and fuel procured for the use of United States military forces stationed in Europe under the North Atlantic Treaty.

(19) The reports required by subsection (a) or (e) of section 2662 of such title and the annual report required by subsection (b) of such section, relating to certain real property transactions.

(20) The proposals referred to in section 2667a(b)(1) of such title, relating to sale and replacement of nonexcess real property.

(21) The notifications required by section 2672(b) of such title, relating to acquisitions of interests in land for more than \$100,000.

(22) The notifications required by section 2676(d) of such title, relating to reductions in scope and increases in cost of a land acquisition.

(23) The notifications and submissions required by section 2687(b) of such title, relating to base closures and realignments.

(24) The annual report required by section 2779(b)(4) of such title, relating to the use of funds appropriated for the elimination of



certain losses caused by fluctuations in currency exchange rates of foreign countries.

(25) The reports required by section 2780 of such title (as redesignated by section 104(2) of this Act), relating to sales or transfers of certain defense articles.

(26) The reports required by section 2803(b) of such title, relating to emergency military construction projects carried out under section 2803 of such title.

(27) The reports required by section 2804(b) of such title, relating to military construction projects not authorized by law.

(28) The notifications required by paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 2805(b) of such title, relating to minor construction in connection with certain relocations of activities from one installation to another.

(29) The reports required by section 2806(c)(2) of such title, relating to contributions for North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure.

(30) The notifications required by subsection (b) of section 2807 of such title and the reports required by subsection (c) of such section, relating to architectural and engineering services and construction design in connection with military construction or military family housing projects.

(31) The notifications required by section 2808(b) of such title, relating to military construction projects in the event of a declaration of war or national emergency.

(32) The justifications and economic analyses required by section 2809(a)(4) of such title, relating to long-term contracts for the construction, management, and operation of certain facilities.

(33) The notification and justifications required by section 2823(b) of such title, relating to disagreements on the availability of suitable alternative housing at locations in the United States where family housing is proposed to be constructed.

(34) The notifications required by section 2827(b) of such title, relating to relocation of military family housing units.

(35) The economic analysis required by section 2828(g)(6)(A) of such title, relating to leasing military family housing facilities.

(36) The notifications required by section 2834(b) of such title, relating to agreements with the Secretary of State for the use of Department of State housing and related services by Department of Defense personnel.

(37) The notifications required by subsections (d) and (e) of section 2853 of such title, relating to reductions in the scope of work or increases in the cost of military construction projects.

(38) The notifications required by section 2854(b) of such title, relating to repair, restoration, or replacement of damaged or destroyed military facilities.

(39) The annual request required by section 2859 of such title, relating to military construction authorizations.

(40) The annual report required by section 2861(a) of such title, relating to military construction activities and military family housing activities.

(41) The annual report required by section 2871(c)(3) of such title (as redesignated by section 104(8) of this Act), relating to military and civilian personnel end strength levels, certain other manpower requirements, base structures, and certain requirements for and information on officers.

(42) The annual report required by section 2871(d)(2) of such title (as redesignated by section 104(8) of this Act), relating to average student training loads.

(43) The annual report required by section 2871(e) of such title (as redesignated by section 104(8) of this Act), relating to operations and maintenance.

(44)(A) The annual and supplemental reports required by section 2872 of such title (as redesignated by section 104(9) of this Act), relating to weapons development and procurement schedules, including the matter required by section 53(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (95 Stat. 1524; 22 U.S.C. 2795b(b)) to be included in such annual reports.

(B) The notifications in lieu of such supplemental reports under subsection (b) of such section 2872.

(45) The Selected Acquisition Reports required by section 2873 of such title (as redesignated by section 104(10) of this Act).

(46) The notifications required by subsection (d)(3) of section 2874 of such title (as redesignated by section 104(11) of this Act) and reports required by subsection (e) of such section, relating to increases in program acquisition unit costs and procurement unit costs of certain major defense acquisition programs.

(47) The notifications required by section 7307(b)(2) of such title, relating to the disposition of naval vessels to foreign nations.

(48) The quarterly report required by section 7434 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the production from the naval petroleum reserve.

(49) The annual report required by section 406(i) of title 37, United States Code, relating to dependents accompanying members of the Armed Forces stationed outside the United States.

(50) The statements and quarterly report required by subsections (c) and (e) of section 709 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Authorization Act, 1975 (88 Stat. 408; 50 U.S.C. App. 2403-1(e)), relating to the export of certain goods, technology, and industrial techniques.

(51) The notifications, summaries, certifications, and reports required by subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 502 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1981 (10 U.S.C. 2304 note), relating to conversion of performance of commercial and other type functions from Department of Defense personnel to private contractors.

(52) The notifications required by section 1201(c) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1984 (Public Law 98-94; 97 Stat. 678), relating to transfers of amounts of authorizations.

(53) Two reports and assessments required by section 1231 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1984 (Public Law 98-94; 97 Stat. 693), relating to certain intercontinental ballistic missile systems.

(54) The reports required by section 307(b)(3) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (98 Stat. 2515; 10 U.S.C. 2304 note), relating to waivers of a prohibition on contracting out certain logistics activities.

(55) The annual report required by section 1002(d)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (98 Stat. 2575; 22 U.S.C. 1928 Note), relating to the supply of munitions and certain aircraft facilities in support of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

(56) The annual report required by section 1002(d)(2) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (98 Stat. 2575; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), relating to the status and cost of the United States commitment to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and certain activities of other North Atlantic Treaty Organization members.

(57) The annual reports required by subsections (c) and (d) of section 1003 of the

Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (98 Stat. 2576; 22 U.S.C. 1928 note), relating to allied contributions to the common defense.

(58) The annual report required by section 1102 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (98 Stat. 2580; 10 U.S.C. 2872 note (formerly 10 U.S.C. 139 Note)), relating to the Strategic Defense Initiative and any other antiballistic missile defense program.

(59) The notifications required by section 1501(c) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (Public Law 98-525; 98 Stat. 2626), relating to transfers of amounts of authorizations.

(60) The reports required by section 1536(g) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (98 Stat. 2633; 46 U.S.C. 1120 note), relating to the Commission on Merchant Marine and Defense.

(61) The certification required by section 125(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99-145; 99 Stat. 601), relating to any new contract for the procurement of 5-ton trucks.

(62) The legislative environmental impact statement required by section 209(c) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99-145; 99 Stat. 610), relating to full-scale development of a small intercontinental ballistic missile or the selection of basing areas for the deployment of such missile.

(63) The certification required by section 222 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99-145; 99 Stat. 613), relating to termination of a prohibition of deployment of a strategic defense system.

(64) The reports required by section 223 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99-145; 99 Stat. 613), relating to the Strategic Defense Initiative.

(65) The quarterly reports required by section 502(c) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99-145; 99 Stat. 621), relating to the obligation of funds appropriated for civilian personnel.

(66) The report required by section 1002 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99-145; 99 Stat. 705), relating to Soviet compliance with arms control commitments.

(67) The annual report required by section 1221(d)(2) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99-145; 99 Stat. 727), relating to a research program to support the polygraph activities of the Department of Defense.

(68) The annual reports required by section 1407 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99-145; 99 Stat. 745), relating to unobligated balances in appropriation accounts.

(69)(A) The certifications required by subsections (b) and (c)(2) of section 1411 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99-145; 99 Stat. 745), relating to the procurement or assembly of binary chemical weapons.

(B) The report required by subsection (e) of such section, relating to consultations among North Atlantic Treaty Organization member nations concerning North Atlantic Treaty Organization's chemical deterrent posture.

(70) The annual reports required by section 704 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1982 (Public Law 97-99; 95 Stat. 1377), relating to contracts for construction in the United States and its possessions.

(71) The economic analyses required by section 802(d)(1) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1984 (97 Stat. 784; 10 U.S.C. 2821 note), relating to proposed military housing rental guarantee agreements.

(72) The notifications required by section 803(b)(2) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1984 (97 Stat. 785; 10 U.S.C. 2821 note), relating to waivers of a requirement to use manufactured or factory-built housing fabricated in the United States by a United States contractor for military family housing construction in foreign countries.

(73) The report required by section 840(d) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99-167; 99 Stat. 998), relating to the sale of land at Fort Jackson, South Carolina.

(74) The notifications required by the proviso in section 8005(m) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1985 (as contained in section 101(h) of the Joint Resolution entitled "Joint Resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes", approved October 12, 1984 (Public Law 98-473; 98 Stat. 1923)), relating to unusual cost overruns incident to overhaul, maintenance, and repair for certain ships.

(75) The annual report required by section 8104(b) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1985 (as contained in section 101(h) of the Joint Resolution entitled "Joint Resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes", approved October 12, 1984 (Public Law 98-473; 98 Stat. 1923)), relating to consultations with members of common defense alliances concerning Strategic Defense Initiative research.

(76) The notifications required by section 8020 or 8021 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986 (as contained in section 101(b) of the Joint Resolution entitled "Joint Resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes", approved December 19, 1985 (Public Law 99-190; 99 Stat. 1206)), relating to transfers of working capital funds.

(77) The notifications required by section 8021 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986 (as contained in section 101(b) of the Joint Resolution entitled "Joint Resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes", approved December 19, 1985 (Public Law 99-190; 99 Stat. 1206)), relating to the obligation of working capital funds to procure war reserve material inventory.

(78) The notifications required by section 8042 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986 (as contained in section 101(b) of the Joint Resolution entitled "Joint Resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes", approved December 19, 1985 (Public Law 99-190; 99 Stat. 1210)), relating to the availability of appropriated funds for intelligence or special activities different from activities justified to the Congress.

(79) The notification required by section 8075 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986 (as contained in section 101(b) of the Joint Resolution entitled "Joint Resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes", approved December 19, 1985 (Public Law 99-190; 99 Stat. 1214)), relating to the acquisition of certain

types of weapons, subsystems, and munitions of European North Atlantic Treaty Organization manufacture.

(80) The certification required by section 8097 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986 (as contained in section 101(b) of the Joint Resolution entitled "Joint Resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes", approved December 19, 1985 (Public Law 99-190; 99 Stat. 1219)), relating to the obligation or expenditure of funds to carry out a test of the Space Defense System (anti-satellite weapon) against an object in space.

(81) The annual report required by the third proviso in the undesignated paragraph under the heading "FOREIGN CURRENCY FLUCTUATION, CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE" in the Military Construction Appropriation Act, 1980 (Public Law 96-130; 93 Stat. 1019), relating to transfers of appropriated funds to eliminate losses in military construction or expenses of family housing caused by fluctuations in foreign currency exchange rates of foreign countries.

(82) The reports required by section 125(a) of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1985 (as contained in section 101(e) of the Joint Resolution entitled "Joint Resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1985, and for other purposes", approved October 12, 1984 (Public Law 98-473; 98 Stat. 1883)), relating to terminations of a prohibition on the availability of appropriated military construction funds to foreign governments ineligible to receive such funds by reason of inadequate drug control measures.

(83)(A) The semiannual report required by section 5(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 3), relating to activities of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense.

(B) The reports required by section 5(d) of such Act (5 U.S.C. App. 3), relating to particular cases of problems, abuses, or deficiencies which have come to the attention of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense.

(C) The statements required by paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 8(b) of such Act (5 U.S.C. App. 3), relating to the exercise of certain authority of the Secretary of Defense with respect to the activities of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense.

(84) The requirement to furnish information and to report to Congress concerning intelligence activities as provided in subsections (a) and (b) of section 501 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413).

(c) CHANGE FROM QUARTERLY TO ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 406(i) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "quarter" in the matter preceding clause (1); and

(2) by striking out "quarter" in clauses (1) and (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year".

—At the end of title V (page 68, after line 3), add the following new section:

SEC. 503. REDUCTION IN PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS ACTIVITIES.

(a) MILITARY DEPARTMENTS AND CINCS.—(1) Not later than September 30, 1988, the Secretary of Defense shall reduce the total number of military and civilian personnel assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the military departments and in the unified and specified combatant commands to perform management headquarters activities or management headquarters support activities

by a number that is at least 10 percent of the total number of personnel assigned or detailed to perform such activities on September 30, 1985.

(2) In computing and in making the reduction required under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense shall exclude personnel in the Office of the Secretary of the Army, the Army Staff, the Office of the Secretary of the Navy, the Office of the Chief Naval Operations, the Headquarters, Marine Corps, the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Air Staff who are assigned or detailed to permanent duty to perform management headquarters activities or management headquarters support activities.

(b) DEFENSE AGENCIES AND DOD FIELD ACTIVITIES.—Not later than September 30, 1988, the Secretary of Defense shall reduce the total number of military and civilian personnel assigned to duty in the management headquarters activities or management headquarters support activities in the Defense Agencies and Department of Defense Field Activities by a number that is at least 15 percent of the total number of personnel performing such activities on September 30, 1985. The number of personnel reduced under this subsection in excess of the reduction required by this subsection may be included in the number required to be reduced by subsection (c).

(c) OTHER ACTIVITIES.—Not later than September 30, 1988, the Secretary of Defense shall reduce the total number of military and civilian personnel assigned to duty in the Defense Agencies and Department of Defense Field Activities, other than personnel assigned to management headquarters activities or management headquarters support activities, by a number that is at least 10 percent below the total number of personnel performing such activities on September 30, 1985.

(d) PROHIBITION AGAINST CERTAIN ACTIONS TO ACHIEVE REDUCTIONS.—The reductions required by subsections (a), (b), and (c) may not be accomplished by recategorizing or redefining duties, functions, offices, or organizations.

(e) ALLOCATIONS TO BE MADE BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall allocate the reductions required by subsections (a), (b), and (c) in a manner consistent with the efficient operation of the Department of Defense.

(2) The Secretary shall also consolidate and eliminate unnecessary management headquarters activities and management headquarters support activities.

(f) REDUCTION NOT APPLICABLE TO NSA OR DIA.—The reductions required by this section do not apply to the National Security Agency or the Defense Intelligence Agency.

(g) AUTHORITY OF COMBATANT COMMANDERS WITH REGARD TO REDUCTIONS.—In the case of a reduction under this section made applicable by the Secretary of Defense to a unified or specified combatant command, the commander of that command, after consultation with the commanders of commands directly subordinated to the commander of the combatant command, shall determine the manner in which the reduction shall be accomplished.

(h) PROHIBITION ON FUTURE INCREASE.—After September 30, 1988, the number of civilian and military personnel assigned to perform activities described in subsections (a), (b), and (c) may not be increased above a number that is 10 percent less than the number of such personnel assigned or detailed to perform such activities on September 30, 1985. The limitation provided in this



subsection shall not apply in time of war or during a national emergency declared by Congress.

(i) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section, the terms "management headquarters activities" and "management headquarters support activities" have the same meanings prescribed for such terms in Department of Defense Directive 5100.73 entitled "Department of Defense Management Headquarters and Headquarters Support Activities", dated January 7, 1985.

H.R. 4428

By Mr. COURTER:

—At the end of title II of division A (page 68, after line 4), insert the following new section:

**SEC. 215. RECONFIGURATION OF STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE PROGRAM.**

(a) **RECONFIGURATION OF SDI PROGRAM.**—The Secretary of Defense shall, consistent with the provisions of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty of 1972—

(1) reconfigure the Strategic Defense Initiative program; and

(2) initiate the development, testing, and deployment of systems for the defense of the United States against attack by strategic ballistic missiles.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—To the maximum extent practicable, the reconfiguration required by subsection (a)(1) shall enable systems developed under the Strategic Defense Initiative program—

(1) to survive against determined defense suppression attacks;

(2) to provide the most effective protection for the largest possible area;

(3) to be cost-effective when deployed against the most effective or most probable countermeasures; and

(4) to be compatible with future systems for defense against strategic and tactical ballistic missiles, including systems designed to defeat ballistic missile threats during the boost phase, post-boost phase, midcourse phase, or terminal phase of their flight trajectory.

—Page 42, after line 16, insert the following new subsection:

(d) **BOOST SURVEILLANCE AND TRACKING SYSTEM.**—Of amounts appropriated to the Defense Agencies other than the Strategic Defense Organization pursuant to authorizations in section 201, \$100,000,000 is available only for the Boost Surveillance and Tracking System (BSTS) program.

—At the end of part B of title IX of division A (page 201, after line 14), insert the following new section:

**SEC. 917. RELEASE OF TECHNICAL DATA.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**"§ 2325. Release of technical data**

**"(a) IN GENERAL.—**

**"(1) RELEASE OF DATA.**—The Secretary of Defense shall, if required to release technical data under section 552 of title 5, release technical data to a person requesting such a release if such person pays all costs reasonably attributable to responding to such request, including reasonable charges for the costs of services of agency personnel relating to—

**"(A) locating the technical data requested;**

**"(B) the review of such technical data to determine whether other restrictions apply; and**

**"(C) duplication and other processing charges.**

**"(2) REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations, pursuant to notice and receipt of public comment, specifying a uniform schedule of fees under this section.

**"(b) DISPOSITION OF COSTS.**—Amounts collected under this section shall be retained by the collecting agency and shall be used to reimburse the costs incurred in complying with requests for technical data.

**"(c) WAIVER.**—The Secretary of Defense shall waive the payment of costs required by subsection (a) which are in addition to costs under section 552 of title 5 if—

**"(1) the request is made by a citizen of the United States or a United States corporation, and such citizen or corporation certifies that the technical data requested is required to enable such citizen or corporation to submit an offer or determine whether it is capable of submitting an offer to provide the product to which the technical data relates to the United States or a contractor with the United States;**

**"(2) the release of technical data is requested in order to comply with the terms of an international agreement; or**

**"(3) the Secretary determines, in accordance with section 552(a)(4)(A) of title 5, that such a waiver is in the interests of the United States.**

**"(d) TECHNICAL DATA.**—In this section, the term 'technical data' means formulae, designs, drawings, blueprints, technical manuals, or computer software."

**(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

**"2325. Release of technical data."**

**(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect at the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

H.R. 5205

By Mr. BROWN of Colorado:

—Page 28, line 1, strike "\$613,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$590,700,000".

H.R. 5234

By Mr. FRENZEL:

—At the end of title III, insert the following new section:

**"Section 317. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by previously enacted law is hereby reduced by 0.7 percent."**